UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF VERMONT

ALICE H. ALLEN, et al.

*

V

*

DAIRY FARMERS OF AMERICA, *

INC., et al. * CIV

* CIVIL FILE NO. 09-230

FAIRNESS HEARING Friday, May 13, 2016 Burlington, Vermont

BEFORE:

THE HONORABLE CHRISTINA R. REISS Chief District Judge

APPEARANCES:

BRENT W. JOHNSON, ESQ., and KIT A. PIERSON, ESQ., Cohen Milstein Sellers & Toll PLLC, 1100 New York Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C.; Attorneys for the Plaintiffs

ROBERT G. ABRAMS, ESQ., BakerHostetler LLP, Washington Square, Suite 1100, 1050 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Washington, D.C.; Attorney for the Plaintiffs

Appearances Cont'd...

ANNE NICHOLS PIERCE
Registered Professional Reporter
United States District Court
Post Office Box 5633
Burlington, Vermont 05402
(802) 860-2227

APPEARANCES CONTINUED:

- STEVEN R. KUNEY, ESQ. Williams & Connolly LLP, 725 Twelfth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C.; Attorney for Defendant Dairy Farmers of America, Inc.
- IAN P. CARLETON, ESQ., Sheehey, Furlong & Behm,
 P.C., 30 Main Street, Burlington, Vermont;
 Attorney for the Defendant
- DANIEL J. SMITH, ESQ., Northeast Dairy Compact Commission Executive Director, 16 State Street, Montpelier, Vermont; Attorney for the Intervenors
- RICHARD T. CASSIDY, ESQ., Hoff Curtis, 100 Main Street, Burlington, Vermont; Attorney for the Intervenors

*** ** ***

ANNE NICHOLS PIERCE
Registered Professional Reporter
United States District Court
Post Office Box 5633
Burlington, Vermont 05402
(802) 860-2227

I N D E X

STATEMENT BY CLASS MEMBER	PAGE	LINE
KENNETH DIBBELL	9	17
STEPHEN H. TAYLOR	12	16
DARREL AUBERTINE	16	8
LYLE WOOD	20	19
GARY GENSKE - on behalf of John J. King	23	22
DOUGLAS RICKER	29	21
PETER SOUTHWAY	35	15
WILLIAM OLIN	42	2
JONATHAN HAAR	46	8
DAVID GALLEY	54	20
LARRY BURGIN	59	15
PATTY BIKOWSKY	63	22
WILLIAM MOODY	67	10
LISA KNAPTON	70	12
REYNARD HUNT	71	8
TIMOTHY MAXHAM	72	25
PATRICK HOWRIGAN	79	15
BILL ROWELL	82	16
WAYNE HURTUBISE	85	24
CLEMENT GERVAIS	87	22
PAUL STANLEY	90	21
BRYAN DAVIS	93	6
CONNIE MENARD	96	15

I N D E X

STATEMENT BY CLASS MEMBER	PAGE	LINE
MARK MAGNAN	100	25
TIMOTHY MAGNANT	102	24
HAROLD HOWRIGAN, JR.	105	7
ALICE H. ALLEN	109	17
ROBIN SWEET	115	13
HEIDI DOLLOFF	117	2
EDGAR KING	119	18
DARLENE REYNOLDS	124	18
ROB MORRILL	127	2
JOSHUA HAAR - on behalf of Claudia Haar, Dave Ward and Rod Jennison	130	18
STATEMENT BY ATTORNEY		
KIT PIERSON, ESQ.	138	12
ROBERT ABRAMS, ESQ.	141	4
DANIEL SMITH, ESQ.	142	7

FRIDAY, MAY 13, 2016

(The following was held in open court at 10:05 a.m.)

COURTROOM DEPUTY: Your Honor, the matter before the Court is civil case number 90-CV-230, Alice Allen, et al., versus the Dairy Farmers of America, Incorporated, et al. Representing the plaintiff are attorneys Kit Pierson, Brent Johnson and Robert Abrams. Representing the defendant are attorneys Steven Kuney and Ian Carleton. And we are here for a fairness hearing.

THE COURT: Good morning. I am going to kind of tell you how we are going to proceed today and give you some ideas of things that you might want to talk about and hopefully answer any questions you will have before you appear.

The Court received approximately 1400 letters. I have read those letters whether or not they were timely, so don't worry about that. A few were not from class members. If you are not a class member, you can't actually object or approve of the settlement. A few were from people who had opted out of the class and so they're no longer class members. But most of them were from people who had closely followed this litigation, that were aware of the claims, that had some very important insights into the dairy industry, this case

and the proposed settlement, and I read them with interest.

So if for any reason you don't get to speak, don't worry. I have read your written comments.

We are going to try to get to everybody today who filed in accordance with the Court's rules about an opportunity to speak. In order to do this, I am going to have to set some ground rules. So I am planning on each of you presenting for about five to seven minutes. I am going to be watching the clock, but I want to focus on what you are saying. Please be careful yourself in that respect, and then I won't have to be rude and interrupt you.

It sometimes helps to collect your thoughts in bullet points: "These are the five things that I want the judge to take away from my remarks." It's fine to repeat other things that -- things that other people have said, but you might want to offer new information.

You can talk about the attorneys' fees if you would like. That's going to be decided in a separate motion. We are going to try to get through everybody who has notified us of their intent to appear in a timely fashion. We will call out the names. You can come forward. You are not going to be under oath. If you, for some reason, wanted to be under oath, that's fine.

It's not required for a fairness hearing. So that -- I will leave that up to you, but I don't expect people will be under oath, and they will not be subject to class -- to cross examination. So nobody will be questioning you about the remarks that you offer.

Please remember that we are in a courtroom, so make sure that your remarks are courteous. I know that people have some strongly held opinions. That's fine. I want to hear them, but I want you to choose language that's appropriate for a courtroom.

Some of the things that I am going to be deciding today may be helpful in framing your remarks. One of the things that I am going to have to look at in terms of approving this settlement is whether it was procedurally fair. Who was involved in the negotiations? How did the negotiations occur? Were they fair and at arm's length? Were opposing viewpoints considered? And, is this a procedurally fair settlement?

The next thing I am going to have to determine is whether this is a substantively fair settlement, and the Court is directed to look at a number of factors to make this determination. These are factors that are set forth in the law:

The complexity, expense and likely duration of the

litigation; the reaction of the class to the settlement; the stage of the proceedings and the amount of discovery completed prior to the settlement; the risks of establishing liability. So how likely was it that the plaintiffs would win at trial or the defendants win at trial? Would there be appeals thereafter? How long would it take to reach a different resolution through a trial?

The risks of establishing damages. The risks of maintaining the class through the trial. So in the event that the class got decertified, we would have a trial for individuals but we would not have a class-action suit. That would be a very different case.

The ability of the defendants to withstand a greater judgment. Could they pay more? Should they pay more? Why should they pay more?

The range of reasonableness of the settlement fund in light of the best possible recovery. So how does this match up to what would happen at trial in the best possible circumstances, but again, factoring in the appeals period, evidentiary rulings, other factors?

And so those are the things I am going to be looking at and you may want to consider as well. And what we are going to do is we are going to get started right away with people, and I know some of you have to

leave, and the attorneys will speak at the end of the hearing.

So it's much more important that I hear from class members than attorneys at this fairness hearing, and the goal is to determine whether this proposed settlement, which I will call the December 2015 settlement, is fair, reasonable and adequate.

The first person is Kenneth Dibbell, and if he would come forward. We are doing this in the order in which we received your notice of intention to speak. I will hear from him.

And I will ask you, when you come forward, if you will just state and spell your name for the record.

KENNETH DIBBELL: And that is Kenneth Dibbell, not Dibbell (pronunciation).

THE COURT: Sorry, sir.

KENNETH DIBBELL: I am only going to give you people today a brief history lesson on the dairy industry.

In 1940, we had 4.66 million licensed and inspected dairy producers. 97 percent of those farms were from one to 29 cows. Over the years, we suffered considerable attrition for various reasons.

We will go fast-forward to 1980, more or less modern times. In 1980, we still had 350,000 dairy

producers in this nation. Today, we're down to 43,000 and falling. That's less than one percent of the farms we had in 1940 producing milk. It's an outrage.

We have taken the hardest-working people in this nation, 14 hours a day, seven days a week, and we have put them out of business due the economic strangulation, failure to pay them what it costs to make the product.

There's a few people responsible for this.

It starts in Washington with our government. USDA, economic research, calculates to current cost of production for 23 states, average 27.66 per hundredweight, but AMS is currently administering a pay price under \$13 per hundredweight. While it's pretty difficult to pay 25, \$27 of the cost with 13 or \$14, Houdini, that's the only one I know of, that could do it.

It's an outrage what we have done to the dairy-producing community, and it's not just the government's fault; the dairy cooperatives' are equally irresponsible for their farmer/owner, quote, members not to come up with a supply management system and quit flooding the market. That's why our price is in the toilet.

Global market kept us going for a couple of years with 15, 17 percent exports. Well, my position on the

global market is we need to get out of the global market. We need to cancel NAFTA, GATT and WTO, which was responsible for doing away with the COOL labeling, and our consumers have a right to know where their food comes from, and that COOL labeling, country-of-origin, labeling, was a good item. And our people deserve to have that, and the good state of Vermont probably does still have it.

Currently -- I am going to leave this with the Court. It's an explanation of the bill that could have solved this problem way back in 2007. The Casey-Specter bill, Senate 1640, had a supply management system, a proper pay price to keep farmers farming, and the surplus, if there was one, was going to be manufactured at the cost of the producers and given to the food banks, a very common-sense principle. Taxpayer money wasn't going to be involved.

I mean, we used to have a system where the government bought the product and gave it away. This was designed with total common sense.

Those who continued to grow and overproduce beyond the market needs were going to pay for the manufacturing, and it was going to be donated to the food banks.

It is my hope that this Court will see the light,

put this thing before a jury. In the Southeast case, a parallel situation, Dean Foods and DFA coughed up \$300 million, and here we have the same situation where Dean Foods got away for 30 mill and DFA is still trying to get away with 50 mill and no fault. It's an outrage. I'm finished. And that if I got time left, and I should have, I'll yield it to Joshua

Car -- Haar. Thank you.

> THE COURT: Thank you.

Next person --

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

This is for the Court. KENNETH DIBBELL:

THE COURT: Okay. And if you give it to Jen, she will take it.

THE COURT: Stephen Taylor.

KENNETH DIBBELL: Thanks, Jen.

STEPHEN TAYLOR: Thank you, your Honor. My name is Stephen H. Taylor; S-t-e-p-h-e-n H. Taylor, T-a-y-l-o-r.

I am a dairy farmer of some 40 years. I farm with my sons in the village of Meriden, New Hampshire. I served from 1982 until 2007 as the commissioner of agriculture for the State of New Hampshire. Throughout my lifetime, my adult lifetime, and involvement in dairy farming, I have had an enormous interest in dairy policy issues, and in retirement I continue to hold that

interest.

I am one of the new named representatives who was admitted to this case by the Court, and I am here today to appear to support the proposed settlement that has been placed before the Court, and I also wish to support the alternative fee motion that has been offered.

The letter that I submitted to the Court on April 27th goes into considerable detail about my position on this matter. I will try at this point just to hit some of the highlights.

I petitioned the Court to enter the case because I was extremely troubled by the apparent heavy focus on monetary relief and the inadequacy of the nonmonetary provisions that were proposed in the initial settlement. I was also deeply concerned about the breakdown in the relationship between the named representatives and the plaintiffs' counsel, and I was further concerned deeply about the fee that was proposed as being excessive.

This proposed settlement represents a significant improvement, in my view, over the first proposal in several respects. Provision for an audit, for an ombudsman, for a clarification on full-supply contracts and testing protocols are all very, very important, but it's important, I think, that this Court recognize that the log jam that was represented in the first proposed

settlement has been broken through a great deal of effort on the part of counsel, on the part of named representatives.

The negotiations that I have been involved with have been very respectful. They have recognized that there are considerable variances in viewpoints. I think everybody who wished had a chance to be heard, and we worked very, very diligently to get to the point we're at today.

The most important provision of this proposed settlement, your Honor, is the provision for an audit, and I think that that is a breakthrough and of extreme importance. Also essential that the audit have adequate resources to be conducted fully and thoroughly.

The new and strengthened provisions of the proposed settlement, I feel, and the Court's power to make them work, can alter the defendants' practices that left us at this -- resulted in the bringing of this action.

Your Honor, I believe the alternative of going to trial is not rational at this point. My feeling is that all could be lost in the long shot of attempting to win at trial.

The majority of the messages the Court has appeared -- has received appear to favor the settlement. There are some very strongly held views in opposition,

and I recognize 'em and I respect them, but there are also thousands of people who have not been heard who are within the class. And I think the attitude of those people can be summed up in this way: They trust the Court in a fiduciary role to manage this matter in their best interests, and I think -- I urge the Court to take that as my view.

Some people look at this as a glass half empty; others look at it as a glass half full. However it is viewed, I think it is worthwhile pursuing the settlement as it is presented today.

Speaking to the fee, the combined DFA, Dean monetary settlement would amount to about \$80 million. I believe a 20-percent allocation for fee, placing that at 16 million, would be proper. In the scale of the business activities that these entities represent, billions and billions of dollars, this recovery is quite small.

Division of the fee. The case is where we are because of the efforts of the new named representatives, and the previously named representatives as well, and also the counsel, and I wish the Court to take note of the hard work and dedication, diligence and talent that was brought to bear by my counsel, Mr. Smith, and Mr. Cassidy. They brought knowledge of the intricacies

of the northeastern dairy industry to bear in a very productive and important way, and they also made certain that the process by which we continued the negotiations were very open and respectful.

Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Darrel Aubertine.

DARREL AUBERTINE: Morning, your Honor.

THE COURT: Good morning.

DARREL AUBERTINE: And thank you for the opportunity. Again, my name is Darrel. I am former commissioner of ag and markets in New York State. My name is D-a-r-r-e-l A-u-b-e-r-t-i-n-e.

I'd like to speak on essentially three issues. I would first like to speak on the issue of the settlement itself in support of the settlement. I would also like to give my thoughts with regard to the comments that you spoke of earlier, these letters from the farm community. I would also like to emphasize my support for my former colleague, Steve Taylor, with regard to the attorneys' fees.

I am a former dairy farmer, some people call recovering dairy farmer, from northern New York State.

And northern New York State, not unlike other places in the nation, faces a lot of issues with regard to outlets

for the milk -- the dairy community does. Like many others, I have been concerned with the apparent manipulation in the marketplace that seems to work to the detriment of the dairy community. I joined the suit to see if something better could be made of the proposed settlement that the Court rejected earlier.

As the Court decided, there was obviously too much focus on money and not enough on an attempt to do more to change the conduct of DFA and DMS in the marketplace, and we were appreciative of the window that we were given last fall to do what we could to improve upon the settlement.

Mr. Smith and myself were instrumental in organizing several meetings in Albany, New York, as well as numerous phone calls, e-mails and the like, to try to put together as best we could an alternative, an enhanced -- the settlement that was rejected.

Now I can't say that we ended up with sweeping reform. We didn't. And from the first meeting with the original class counsel, it was very apparent that the case wouldn't allow for this anyway. But I still strongly believe the settlement is an important, positive first step toward a more open marketplace.

The attorneys have identified the many new proposals and parts thereof and how they would work with

the original provisions. The net result should -should be that the defendants are going to have to
operate in a more transparent fashion both as a business
enterprise and now as they relate to their own members.

Even if I'm not a DFA member, I, for one, plan to keep a close eye on the position of advisory council member. The time and resources are there now for that position to make a real change. The net change should come in the form of higher farm gate prices.

I will also be very interested to observe the ombudsperson's work. This is an innovation that should prove to be a real change in the cooperative's operating culture. I expect the other cooperatives will be observing to see how this works as well.

Now, with regard to the many letters you have received, I would like to provide a few thoughts of my own as a former commissioner but that as a multigenerational farmer as well.

First, I think it's very meaningful that you have received well over a thousand letters. I believe it's rare that the farm community in general would respond in such a manner. I also think you have gotten a representative response. The relative number of supporters versus the opponents indicate by -- indicate by their letters the overwhelming support which is

strongly in favor of the new provisions for the reasons stated. And I -- also bringing this case to conclusion was a major factor in farmers that I had the opportunity to talk to.

Now, as far as the fee, I would like to associate myself with the comments of my former colleague, Steve Taylor. The legal fee of over \$22 million, roughly 25 percent of the settlement, exceeds -- it would seem to me, is excessive and based on the criteria used in the Southeast case and in the Dean Food case here in the Northeast.

While I do not believe, as I said, that the settlement is an important first step toward a more open marketplace, it still won't accomplish as much as was done down south. Of course the monetary recovery, even combined with the prior settlement, isn't nearly the same.

I am not doubting that substantial -- a substantial fee has been earned. Again, as a policymaker, I understand that we need to provide an incentive for attorneys to pursue these difficult cases, but Steve and myself believe that a proposed 20-percent, roughly, combined fee, amounting to \$16 million -- and again, I pretend to be no expert -- would seem to be more in line.

I also believe, as Mr. Taylor just -- just said, 1 2 that Mr. Smith and Mr. Cassidy deserve more than a straight-line share of the fee. Mr. Smith, in 3 particular, really did come in at a time and use his 4 5 expertise for the -- from a dairy perspective on dairy 6 issues to get us to the point where we are today. 7 THE COURT: So we're coming up on your time. 8 Go ahead. Just a couple --9 DARREL AUBERTINE: In closing, I believe the 10 overwhelming majority of the dairy farm community do want to establish clear guidelines as to what is and is 11 12 not acceptable in the marketplace. And as I said 13 earlier, the settlement should not be looked at as 14 sweeping reform but rather a positive step in an effort 15 to bring fairness and equity to the marketplace; 16 therefore, I do support settling of the case. 17 THE COURT: Thank you. 18 The next person is Lyle Wood. 19 LYLE WOOD: Good morning, your Honor. 20 THE COURT: Good morning. 21 LYLE WOOD: My name is Lyle J. Wood, L-y-l-e 22 J. W-o-o-d. I own and operate Wood Farms, LLC, in Clayton, New 23 24 York, with my cousin, Scott Bourcy. I'm a 25 third-generation dairy farmer. I have worked at the

farm since I was nine years old.

The farm was started in 1945 by my grandfather,
Henry Wood, with 16 cows. We currently milk over 1200
cows on two dairies and ship our milk through the home
dairy independently and through our other dairy through
Agri-Mark. We have been with DMS since they have been
incorporated and started, and at the other dairy we have
been at Agri-Mark for four years.

Additionally, I am a state director for DairyOne, and I am in favor of settling this lawsuit. I have a wife, Jennifer, who is here with me today, and I have three children: Hannah, Henry and Harrison.

At DairyOne, the core of DairyOne is the belief in agriculture's integrity; integrity, professionalism, commitment and innovation. That's the key to our long-term success at DairyOne.

The DairyOne milk lab is one of the largest of its kind in North America. Our staff excels at testing milk accurately. DairyOne has invested in top-of-the-line equipment.

Every day the lab receives 2500 to 3,000 bulk tank milk samples tested for food safety and farmer payment purposes. DFA makes up only half of our bulk tank business. Each day the lab also tests an average 20,000 individual cow milk samples. Farmers use these results

to better manage their herds. The large number of samples the lab receives every day requires a system that is designed to provide accurate results for samples, but not making --

THE COURT: So let me just stop you. This happens to anybody who reads, you speed up. I do it to her all the time. So she is having a hard time keeping up with you.

LYLE WOOD: Oh. My wife told me when I came up to slow down, so --

THE COURT: That's okay. Whenever -- when you read, you speed up. Go ahead. You are doing fine.

LYLE WOOD: Sorry. I had it written down.

So the lab has approximately 20,000 samples a day that they receive in the lab. And at DairyOne, our board is made up of 17 directors, 14 which are elected at large and then three DFA board members, to make a total of 17.

The milk analyzers are checked every week by the USDA at our lab. There are 12 people involved in doing the samples on a daily basis. Every sample is handled by at least three employees during every test. The lab is regulated by numerous state and federal agencies. For example, this winter three different agencies visited over three weeks to inspect the laboratory.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I am in favor of settling this lawsuit because DMS has been good to us since we have been with DMS. have been independent. We have never been threatened or felt threatened, neither way. Any time we've had a problem or anything going on with DMS, they have been very helpful in solving any of our problems, from a test sample or anything else that we have done with them. And they have always -- they have never, you know, wanted us to be in DFA, be in anything else, and being Agri-Mark at the other dairy, they still could care less, you know, what we do, and I don't know how we would market our milk if we didn't have DMS to go through. And with DMS, we have had -- DFA also helps us out with certain problems even though we don't -- we are not a member of the co-op for DFA. So that's all I got to say. THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. LYLE WOOD: Thank you. THE COURT: Gary Genske on behalf of John J. I should say Gary Genske. King. GARY GENSKE: Good morning, your Honor. THE COURT: Good morning. GARY GENSKE: Can the clerk hand you -- I have a typed --

1 THE COURT: Sure. 2 GARY GENSKE: I'm a dairy farmer from New 3 Mexico. THE COURT: So make sure she can take -- the 4 5 court reporter can take down your -- the spelling of 6 your name. 7 GARY GENSKE: Okay. Might as well be sworn in 8 too. 9 THE COURT: Okay, if you want to. 10 (Gary Genske was duly sworn.) GARY GENSKE: I'm a dairy farmer from New 11 12 Mexico. We milk about 2,000 cows. I'm a C --THE COURT: So you are -- you are not part of 13 14 the class, but you are speaking on behalf of somebody who is? 15 16 GARY GENSKE: Yes. 17 THE COURT: Okay. 18 GARY GENSKE: I'm -- a brief introduction of 19 myself. 20 THE COURT: Okay. 21 GARY GENSKE: I qualify myself first as a 22 dairy farmer. I produce for Dairy Farmers of America. 23 They owe my dairy \$2 million every day of the week. And 24 I am a CPA. Our dairy clients produce about 12 percent 25 of the milk in the country in 31 states. So nobody's

more addicted to this industry than probably I am.

However -- good morning, your Honor -- I am here with resumé attached at the request of dairy farmer and subclass member John J. King from -- I am going to say it wrong -- Pequea, Pennsylvania, to speak on his behalf and to object to the proposed second amended settlement agreement.

In the proposed settlement agreement, defendants DFA/DMS offer, aside from the \$50 million, other concessions that give the illusion that the defendants will become more transparent to their co-op membership.

The agreement was written -- or as written, in my opinion, will do very little to change the DFA/DMS management behavior. Various provisions of the agreement are a form over any real substance.

First of all -- this is a total of five minutes. I timed it several times. All right.

First of all, DFA is a cooperative organized under the laws of the state of Kansas, Chapter 7. I do have it attached, the state law. And the state law states:

Associations organized under this act shall be deemed nonprofit as they are not organized to make a profit for themselves as such or for their members as such but only for their members as producers.

Second, DFA is a cooperative whose farmer net

equity has diminished over the last 10 years from 722 million in 2006 -- that's page 13 attached -- to 470 million in 2015 -- page three attached.

Third, it is a cooperative that has not made any net profit from its own operations and has made profits only from joint ventures in all of the last 10 years -- pages -- even numbered pages 4 through 14 -- illustrating that only milk-buying customers are making money. The co-op and its member producers are not.

Fourth, it is a cooperative offering an out-of-court settlement in this and other antitrust cases. The proposed settlement agreement with the stated goals -- on page 20 of the agreement -- to improve producer pay prices and net income margin for dairy farmers, and it also provides the prudent investment of some proceeds from milk sales that advances the interests of DFA/DMS shippers. The proposed advisory council will be severely limited in achieving any meaningful results. Only granting the advisory council access to the information already presented to DFA's Northeast Area Council, as the agreement calls for, is not sufficient for the advisory council to achieve the above stated goals.

The allegations contained in the original complaint occurred under the watchful eye of the Northeast Area

Council, therefore, the information DFA provides to the council obviously falls short of full disclosure of information, so restricting the advisory council to only the information the Northeast Area Council receives from DFA will severely limit the effectiveness of the advisory council's purpose.

The purpose of the settlement agreement does not make clear how the findings and recommendations of the proposed advisory council get communicated to other than DFA's point of contact or how the council's findings and recommendations will get presented to the Northeast Area Council or, more importantly, to the corporate board in Kansas City. Additionally, the advisory council will severely be bound by confidentially -- confidentiality provisions -- page 26 of the agreement.

One more page. The proposed agreement, on page 32 and -3, indicates that DFA's financial information is prepared in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles. It may be true, but providing the advisory council with only the published accounting reports will not satisfy the goals of the advisory council. Published financial information did not prevent the alleged clandestine antitrust activities of DFA and DMS.

As a CPA and a DFA dairy farmer, I resent the

insinuation that generally accepted accounting principle financial statements would disclose illegal business practices. And for DFA management and any legal representative in this matter to hide illegal business activities behind accounting information published by accountants is a misrepresentation.

These apparent rights for DFA to censor or suppress the advisory council's findings or recommendations, and the restriction of all of DFA's records, essentially makes the advisory council's effort no more than a rubber stamp of approval of DFA's Northeast Dairy Council actions. So why have an advisory council and make the settlement -- this settlement provision appear to be a material concession on the part of defendant DFA? Do these provisions provide transparency for DFA and DMS for farmers? I think not.

The proposed settlement agreement as written, in my opinion, will have very little impact on how DFA and DMS will do business in the future. If the Court cannot grant the proposed advisory council access to all of DFA and DMS records and reasonable dissemination of the council's findings, I would urge the Court to allow this case to go to trial. Our co-op's behavior must change.

With continual decline, as Ken mentioned earlier, of dairy farmers in the country and continued lack of

enough profitability for sustainability, we dairy 1 2 farmers feel we are in the center of a DFA circular firing squad picking off dairymen and eventually killing 3 itself in the process. 4 5 THE COURT: So you are right at your time. 6 little bit more? 7 GARY GENSKE: Just my proposal. 8 THE COURT: Okay. Go ahead. 9 So I ask the Court: Reject the GARY GENSKE: 10 second amended agreement and let this matter go to 11 trial, or the proposed settlement -- order the proposed 12 settlement agreement to provide the proposed advisory 13 council full access to all requested records wherever 14 located, to have all findings of the advisory council 15 published without limitation, that the advisory council 16 to be held harmless without retaliation in the same way 17 all attorneys in this case wish to be held harmless, and 18 to appoint myself as the chair of the advisory council. 19 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. 20 Douglas Ricker. 21 DOUGLAS RICKER: Good morning. 22 THE COURT: Good morning. DOUGLAS RICKER: I would like to -- first 23 24 thing I do is second what the guy just had to say. 25 THE COURT: So we -- I know your name. Would

you just spell it for the record.

DOUGLAS RICKER: Okay. Douglas Ricker, R-i-c-k-e-r, from Sussex, New Jersey. I hope I don't tear up.

I been coming here the last three times with my wife. She's unable to be here today. She has blood clots in both lungs and in her legs, so I'm here representing her and myself. I'd like to give a little history not only of the dairy business since 1937 when I was born, and to the present, which sadly comes to 78 years.

I started out as a young kid not only milking cows but belonging to one of the largest co-ops in New Jersey, and I started coming to the meetings, and I'm a person don't listen to what you say but I listen to what you don't say, and it's very obvious.

So I was going to this co-op meeting, I seen what was going wrong, and no one else could see it, so I brought it up before the board, and then within a month's time they filed bankruptcy.

The vice president of the organization came to me. He said, "I been here every meeting, every executive meeting. How do you find out?" And I said, "Don't listen to what they say. You listen to what they don't -- what they don't say."

I've been at farm bureau membership. I'm just not some guy down the road. I was the one that made the motion back in the '70s, to start a Northeast dairy committee and farm bureau, and I was a member of that structure for several years, and when this problems what's going on now started, I called my neighbor over my back fence, Lou Dobbs, and I asked him to do a story on the problems with DMS/DFA and what the problems were happening, and he did a very good job.

A couple years after that, we had a large tornado in our farm that put us out of business, so -- a few months after that Kit Pierson gave me a call, and we welcomed to -- him to our house, and we spent half the day with him and giving him all the stuff that I knew about what was going on, and a lot of this stuff that I was talking to him about was the founder of the person who started this lawsuit, Mr. Bunting. He's no longer with us. But when Kit got -- and I got done speaking, he says, "You know anyone that can help us out with this case?" And I said yes, I have a good friend. I always don't agree with him, but times to have a best friend, it's best that you always don't agree. So you had some lively discussions.

And this guy sits back here to my left,
Mr. Southway. We go battles here and there, and I have

disagreed with him and have agreed. We had our depositions taken, and we were advised by Mr. Johnson that we don't talk to each other, and I could understand, we're getting ready for a lawsuit, don't talk to each other.

So finally, I don't know, it was a year now, in July, when decided to -- not to go to court, and I got a call from Mr. Johnson telling us that we're not going to court, we're going to try to settle the case, and so I felt like I could call Mr. Southway.

I gave him a call, and he and I both agreed that, hey, we want this going to court and not be settled. So my thought was all on the same page. That was July. And by December, Mr. Southway and I were talking, and he said, "Well, I been sending some letters to your Honor in the supporting of the settlement," and I said, "No, no, no, no. We agreed we don't want to do this."

So -- and as time proceeded, I heard Mr. Southway said he was going to replace someone on one of the committees, and I come up here and try to make that not happen. He's not only my friends, we disagree once in a while.

So as this went on, we prevented that from happening. Your Honor was very wise and agreed to leave the Haars on the case, and I saw right. Then I come

back, and I got a slap across my face. Not only did Mr. Southway got on the committee, his wife, one of their partners got on the committee, from New Jersey. And I have had 60 years of experience in this, problems in the dairy business, and working with Mr. Bunting on this case to get it started, and, your Honor, you -- respectful to you, you appointed this committee of those -- those four people from New Jersey, and that turned the tide on the vote, and that was a mistake, your Honor.

I don't want to -- but you don't make it unbalanced. You come in and get four people that I considered didn't know anything about the case.

Mr. Southway knew some of the problems, but the other ones, I never seen 'em to a meeting anywheres, whether it's in Albany or it's in Texas or wherever we were, was farm bureau and other things getting things done.

So let's leave that alone right there, but --

THE COURT: So we are coming --

DOUGLAS RICKER: Two other things I want to make a short comment on.

I got a phone call one day. They said, "Why don't you call Minnesota and see if you're in or out on this case." So I called out to Minnesota. They have no record of me being involved with this case. I never get

any letters involved with this case. I have been through all this stuff of being ready for trial, and that's what happened. But the thing about this case, it ain't worth the paper it's written on. I mean true, honest. I have been on our state board of agriculture in New Jersey, and I don't know if you know Mr. Phil Alampi, one of the most popular secretary of agriculture, goes way back, and he -- I been on bonding committees with him to get co-ops and independent dealers in New Jersey bonded. We got statutes set up that you just can't throw someone out; you have to give 'em so many days before they can do that, but it's not fair.

So I don't know whether, on this case, I'm in or I'm out, but Mr. Eby -- if you don't resolve this and let it go to court, Mr. Eby, which I have great respect for, is going to -- they have opt out. They were in on the start, the whole thing, all over again, but the thing that caused it to happen this way, when you go and have a imbalance voting on the thing, that is -- your Honor, that is unfair. All the years I put in, I deserve more respect than that.

So Mr. Southway is still my friend. My wife now will be able tomorrow to take Mr. and Mrs. Southway's daughter to a dairy princess seminar in New Jersey.

We're still going to be friends. I am not going to hit 1 2 He is not going to hit me. Right, Mr. Southway? THE COURT: Well, that's good, and we are 3 coming up on Mr. Southway's time, so this is a good 4 5 segue. 6 DOUGLAS RICKER: Oh, God. 7 THE COURT: All right. 8 DOUGLAS RIKCER: I have 10 more minutes to 9 speak, please? 10 THE COURT: No, thank you. Thank you No. 11 very much. 12 DOUGLAS RICKER: You're welcome. 13 THE COURT: Let's have Mr. Southway come forward. 14 15 PETER SOUTHWAY: Good morning, your Honor. 16 THE COURT: Good morning. 17 PETER SOUTHWAY: Peter Southway, 18 S-o-u-t-h-w-a-y. 19 I wasn't quite prepared to have such an 20 introduction to your court today, but I got one. 21 However, I think what Doug says is actually very, very 22 important, and let me explain why it's important. 23 I'm here today on behalf of my wife and I, who were 24 appointed as additional class representatives. She is a 25 little more comfortable on the farm with the grandkids,

so I am going to do the speaking.

This hearing is really about equity for all of the class members. I am an independent producer. I was willing to testify against DFA and DMS in this case from the very beginning because of the antitrust issues that were in the case. This case has morphed over time.

My experience as 25-year commercial banker, I spent a lot of time with antitrust litigation in the MasterCard, Visa, American Express world, spent a lot of time in federal court in Newark and New York City, so I look at the case a lot differently, and what I have done is try to take this case apart from the very beginning to today as a class representative, what is provable, what is winnable, and what is not.

And that's the important part for this case to be analyzed, because if we can't prove it and win it at trial, we really don't have anything. So what I would like to deal with is what are the known factors and what are the unknown factors.

You know, we hear a lot about the monetary award in this case. At 50 million, farmers may get \$4,000.

Well, if it was a hundred million, they'd get eight. If it was \$150 million, maybe they'd get 12. Because of the large class, there's no big pot of gold for any individual class member here.

So I think as when you analyze the monetary data of the settlement of this thing, it really does -- becomes not important, but it is an \$80 million achievement. I dare find anybody else who has brought a case in the Northeast that put \$80 million back into the farmers' pool. It's not a \$10 coupon like a lot of typical class-action cases ended up to be.

The second thing that's known and unknown is we look at the injunctive relief. What's written in the agreement, we know and we can read it. And we need to read it carefully. For example, we just heard testimony from an accountant who said that the advisory council member doesn't have records of DMS. It says right in the agreement they have all the records of DMS and NEAC. So you need to read carefully what the "and" means and not make statements that really are not correct.

I also believe the advisory council and the farmer ombudsperson are going to be under your authority because you are going to sign this agreement if it goes forward and it's settled. I have asked our attorneys, if we reach a point six months down the road, that we can have an agreed discussion and find out if the advisory council and ombudsperson are fulfilling their obligations. If they are not, they have agreed with me that they will come back and we'll file a motion if we

have to because we believe that those positions are important. We believe they can have far-reaching effects. And I think it's important that the Court recognizes that and will also push forward the settlement.

So I think the injunctive relief is substantial, it's brought coverage, it's court ordered. The class representatives who are involved, the initial ones and the additional ones, have spent a lot of time, a lot of phone calls, a lot of e-mails, a lot of discussions, meetings in person to try to arrive to the product we are at. And I understand we don't come to an agreement.

What I have tried to do is say what are the emotional issues and what are the factual issues in this case. And I can agree with -- Mr. Dilbert, is it? The first speaker today?

THE COURT: Dibbell.

PETER SOUTHWAY: It's a shame to see the dairy industry go away, but you know what? That's part of America. We have seen a lot industries go away. Consolidation is here today. I don't believe that this case is going to resolve the consolidation issues of the dairy industry.

When you look at proposals put up against DFA -- let's put 'em into receivership. Well, I think their

creditors and their commercial paper people are going to be first in line in receivership and, wait a minute, we'll run the company. And if their creditors are going to run the company, I don't think us dairy farmers are going to work out too well.

Make 'em a for-profit company. Let's think about that. For-profit. I was shareholder-driven organization, did it for 25 years, did all the SEC work. I know what shareholder-driven companies do. We are after shareholder profits. Shareholder profits are going to conflict with co-op profits.

Capper-Volstead was put in place so that dairy farmers, farmers across this country, can enjoy the immunity, and destroying that would be devastating not only for dairy -- DFA in the Northeast -- and again, it sounds like I am a DFA apologist, and I hate to say I am not, but we have DFA members across this United States of America that we would impact in this case if this Court would say, boom, they no longer have co-op exemption. That would be horrible. That would be a wrong decision for us to even ask for, never mind for the Court to do.

Back to the certainty issues: milk testing, adulterated milk, block-voting changes. These are all covered in this agreement in detail. We have never had

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

that protection before, and I think that's important to recognize. And by the way, a farmer does not have to know in advance what milk he wants to get tested. The agreement says he can do it at any time if he thinks he is having a problem. That's what the agreement says.

I also think that, in closing, the organized opposition in this case was intent on trying to drive emotional issues, and emotional issues don't typically get solved well in a court of equity. We need to focus on what's fair for every member across the board. And I believe that the settlement we have brought forth here is a fair settlement. Is it a perfect settlement? No. Would we love to see more? Yes. But that's what happens when you settle. You get as much as you possibly think you can against the risk of not accepting The risk of a trial, the risk of value limitations, the risk of class decertification, the risk of appeals. Long time before any money, if won, could ever be put into a dairy farmer's pocket. So I think it's time to settle, and I believe that our role is to try to be as a peacemaker.

I also would like to throw one other little thing out there for people to think about. You know, we have had very experienced attorneys in this case. I am amazed at their resumés from a professional point of

view and what they have accomplished in other class-action cases, some of them incredibly well. And I believe class-action lawyers are the answer to all prior abuse in the United States because they ultimately bear the burden of bringing abuse and settling it and stating the class is going forward.

If these attorneys thought that they could win a 3-, 4-, \$500 million settlement, you think they are going to stand here and accept 20 percent, 30 percent of the fees today? So I bow a little bit to the expertise that they represent at the table and say: You know what? If they think this is where we ought to be, this is where we ought to be because the evidence isn't there to bring us further. If it was there, I think they'd like to be talking today about 30 percent of a \$500 million settlement --

Sorry, Mr. Kuney.

-- rather than 20 percent of a \$50 million settlement. So I think we just -- as dairy farmers, we need to keep that in the back of our mind, that if our attorneys are saying this is as far as we can go, they're telling us that for a reason, not just because they don't want to make money today.

THE COURT: Thank you.

PETER SOUTHWAY: Thank you.

THE COURT: William Olin.

WILLIAM OLIN: Good morning, and thank you for the opportunity to speak.

My name is William Olin, W-i-l-l-i-a-m O-l-i-n.

I'm a dairy farmer in Nineveh, New York, a little bit east of Binghamton. I have been since 1980. My wife and I milk 57 cows at the present time. During the time frame of the lawsuit we were between 125 and 155, but we downsized a year ago when I got too old. Older.

I have been involved with Dairylea for my entire life. My dad was a Dairylea member. We started our own farm. We were Dairylea members. I am active in other farm organizations and in our church. Dairy farming is the only job I ever wanted, and it's the only job I am lucky to have ever had. And I think it's time to settle this lawsuit, and I'd like to address a few of the things that are involved.

My observation of DMS: Before DMS was formed, I had three milk trucks going by my farm. We had Dairylea, we had one from DFA for a neighbor, and another neighbor that was Crowley's. And after DMS was formed, one milk truck picked up all the milk, but the three farms still got their milk check from their original vendor that they were doing business with. So it has lowered the cost of assembling the milk, and I

think that's a benefit to us farmers.

As far as block voting goes, I think that's absolutely necessary to marketing orders. There's a lot of issues that need to have a decision made that are just administrative stuff, and you are not going to get farmers to take the time to go and cast their vote on mundane stuff, but they still had the opportunity, if they wish, to abstain or to oppose the cooperative's vote in the block vote.

As far as conspiring to lower prices, I think that DFA has done the opposite. They've paid a competitive price to what my neighbors have gotten. They have also got premiums from processors for things like quality, for things like rBST-free, some help on hauling. So there are -- that's extra money that comes into our pool of money.

And in addition, Dairylea and DFA have programs to help reduce the cost of producing the milk through sort of a buying group kind of thing, so it doesn't matter what your price of milk is, how high it is, if your cost of producing milk is higher yet, you're not going to make money. We have ups and downs in milk prices. Two years ago, when we were getting \$27 for milk, I didn't hear anybody say, "Good job, DFA."

The cost of production of milk is not -- meeting

the production of milk is not DFA's job. Their job is to market my milk, reliably and competitively, and I think they have done that.

It is up to the members of DFA to choose the management and direction of our cooperative, not the court or not the outsiders, and I have been active all my life in cooperatives, and I have never been turned down in an effort to take part and express my opinion. There are some that won't be satisfied with any settlement without doing maximum damage do DFA and, in a good day, put them out of business, and I think that would be a real shame.

There is no coercion here in getting me here. I much rather be home planting corn, but I feel strongly that it's time to settle this lawsuit. I am proud to be a member of DFA. Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

Robert B. Jennison. Roderick, sorry.

So, Roderick Jennison?

JOSHUA HAAR: Roderick Jennison happens to be a neighbor of ours. He was unable to attend today, but --

THE COURT: Okay. So I am going to have to go to the next person, but you are coming up --

JOSHUA HAAR: I have here his signed witness

1 and attested proxy. 2 THE COURT: Okay. Well, he needs -- this is for appearing in person. So how about we take you --3 you are going to be next. We have 12 and 13 are Claudia 4 5 and Jonathan Haar, and the next person will be David 6 Ward then. 7 JOSHUA HAAR: All right. 8 THE COURT: Is David Ward here? 9 JONATHAN HAAR: We have Dave Ward's proxy 10 also. 11 THE COURT: Okay. So that will move us 12 through. 13 Do you have anybody else's so we will cross them off the list? 14 15 CLAUDIO HAAR: Yes. He has my proxy as well. 16 THE COURT: Okay. And -- okay. So let's have 17 Jonathan Haar. 18 JONATHAN HAAR: We will go with me first. 19 CLAUDIA HAAR: I'm sorry, what did you say? 20 THE COURT: Well, you told me he had your 21 proxy, David Ward's proxy and Roderick Jennison's proxy. 22 CLAUDIA HAAR: Yes, ma'am. 23 THE COURT: So that leads us to Jonathan Haar. 24 CLAUDIA HAAR: Okay. 25 THE COURT: If you want to speak yourself, you

can, but if he has got your proxy, that's the purpose of having him speak. Okay.

CLAUDIA HAAR: Absolutely. The proxies are in this notebook, so just for functional -- functionality, Jonathan also has his exhibits in here as well. So may I approach the bench?

THE COURT: Sure.

JONATHAN HAAR: Good morning, your Honor.

THE COURT: Good morning.

JONATHAN HAAR: This is Jonathan Haar. That's H-a-a-r.

I want to apologize concerning the supplemental briefs. They're a little disheveled, our exhibits, I guess we would call them. If -- if it would be helpful to the Court, we would request that we could rebrief them. We were planning on presenting oral explanation of all of them, but obviously we can't do that in five minutes, so we would make that request.

So let me just -- I will start with by way of clarity with regards to the people who are my fellow DFA members. I am in no way disparaging them or my fellow class representatives with whom I am standing in opposition to them as well as the settlement. I respect their positions in their --

As I said in my second declaration, which is on the

docket -- my copy is not docketed, so I don't have the docket reference for that.

I'd like to get sworn.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Okay. You may do so.

(Jonathan P. Haar was sworn.)

THE COURT: Go ahead.

JONATHAN HAAR: Okay. I would like to speak to -- with regards to procedure. I am going to state that Mr. Brent Johnson engaged in professional misconduct in misrepresenting the facts of the law on -toward the end of the negotiation process on a phone It was the Friday before Christmas, on or about the Friday before Christmas. He basically went on a rant explaining to the -- all the class representatives were on the phone at that point in time. I'm not sure if Mr. Taylor was there or not. But to the best of my knowledge, everyone was there. And he explained the relative merits of settlement over trial, and he said, "If you go to trial, you will get no injunctive relief. You will get nothing on full-supply agreements. You'll get nothing -- you won't get an ombudsperson. You will get nothing on milk testing. You will get no relief. You will get absolutely no relief. You might get a little more money, which all of you said you are not interested in more money."

So I confronted him. I said, "Excuse me. You're wrong. That's factually incorrect."

He said, "No, you're wrong, but I am not going to convince you by arguing with you."

So I said, "No, if I'm wrong, please explain to me how I'm wrong. You have a responsibility there." I said, "You have a prayer of relief in the complaint that clearly lays out and includes the caveat that the judge" -- your Honor in this case -- "could issue injunctive relief as you see -- deem appropriate. Furthermore, injunctive relief issued at trial, they don't deal with -- you would not deal with Mr. Kuney. You would look for remedy and that would be that."

So after representing that the -- we would lose at trial -- and you have 150 opt-outs and -- led by Mike Eby, that are pursuing the same claims with attorneys that we have brought to this Court previously, so there's apparently some merit to our antitrust claim.

Yes, so -- after that call -- and this is all documented in our e-mails, exhibits.

Oh, in addition, Mr. Foix and Mr. Dan Smith engaged in the same misconduct. I have shared with this Court how I have been called to Madison County, my home county, to serve jury duty, and the judge explained the

case before us and explained how all the evidence works and everything, and he said -- he -- the case was -- it was a burglary, but the person who had done the burglary was not the person on trial. The person on trial never entered the building. The person on trial simply drove the getaway car.

Mr. Foix and Mr. Smith did not utter a word the whole time Mr. Brent Johnson ranted and raved about how there's nothing in -- in trial, and then this lie was repeated by class representatives Southway, Aubertine, those in support of the settlement, you know, there's really -- this is the very best we can do because we can't get anything at trial, or we'll only get very little, or -- I feel misrepresenting, obviously misrepresenting the prospects, you know, laying aside whether you win or lose. Obviously you could lose, and, you know, that's a reality. So.

See what else did I have.

Mr. Taylor references he wanted an audit.

Mr. Aubertine referenced the same thing, the ACM specifically. I was dealing mostly with the substance of the settlement, but I felt that extremely important to get that in.

So Mr. Taylor and Mr. Aubertine both represented they wanted additional audits. Mr. Genske spoke to the

item of the audit and the advisory committee person specifically denied the right to get an audit, no matter what the budget item or, you know, he couldn't use his limited budget to do a limited audit of a particular aspect of the business. No audits, because an auditor would have a responsibility to report wrongdoing is what I realized later.

In summary, there were a few things -- the reason the ombudsperson and the -- I don't mean to talk fast but I have five minutes.

The reason the ombudsperson and the advisory committee person came into being was because in the Southeast, Mr. Foix, on a conversation, represented that -- represented that there had been a committee formed, an academic committee, a -- an academic chosen by the defendants, an academic chosen by the plaintiffs and an academic chosen by them, and that farmers could bring information to that person, and -- and I asked, "Is this a binding committee?" Mr. Foix represented to me that indeed it was binding because the defendants had signed the agreement so they had agreed to abide by the recommendation of the committee.

The way the defendants got out of any commitment there is the money ran out with regards to notifying the farmers, because I called one of the committee members.

He told me, "We never heard anything. We never saw what they sent to the farmers. I think they left the fox in charge of the hen house," was the quote.

So -- so from that, I said, you know, this idea might have merit. This might be a way that we can bring -- that we might be able to bring about change. That idea does not represent change as this settlement does not represent change, and you will hear and you have heard how this settlement is a step, a first step, a beginning, a -- no, it's a settlement. It closes the door.

The caveat that they used in the Southeast to keep information under file is the same one that's in this existing settlement. That's why the information in the Southeast is -- to the best of my knowledge, that record is mostly sealed because of the provision that third-party members who are involved in these agreements could represent that they don't want these agreements disclosed. So functionally, you're not going to get disclosure. And then --

Oh, the other thing was the milk testing. I represented -- you know, you had -- we had talked about divesture. I brought to you, and you will see in your exhibit, the two little milk tubes. Now, if they had gone with the idea I represented, which is extremely

easy -- and it's Donna Hall's. I'll give Donna Hall the credit. It's extremely simple. Send two sample tubes. You leave one at every farm, take that one label, run it over the top of the sample tube, and you -- you left that there.

Now every farm every time I could create my own record of alleged wrongdoing or I could check it out and find out that, indeed, everything is fine. If there's a spoiled load, I immediately have recourse. You will notice in the adulterated loads, the first caveat is, well, if there's any sample remaining --

Now, bear in mind, this is a milk plant that's run by milk supplied by the defendants. They have a compelling reason to make sure that there's no sample left. This whole settlement is based on we're relying on the complete integrity of the defendants, and one of my e-mails I really liked, I quoted Patrick Henry, that "I have no teacher but history."

And they're in federal court coast to coast, multiple cases. Apparently there's some integrity issue somewhere.

THE COURT: So you're almost out of time.

Just a couple more points.

JONATHAN HAAR: Yes.

So I mentioned milk testing, that to leave those

tubes in would destroy a lot of the control because, you know, then --

So my summary of substance.

This stuff is all in.

I wrote -- toward the end of that binder there's 43 pages. They're handwritten. Sorry about that. And they are double-spaced, so it's not really that much writing, but --

I am just trying to think if there's anything -I represented about the important first step.

Professional misconduct. Sorry to think out loud.

THE COURT: That's all right.

JONATHAN HAAR: And, again, my -- my second declaration, which basically states, "In my declaration I did not mean to -- I did not inform my fellow DFA farmers or farmers that market their milk through DMS are in collusion with regards to the antitrust violations described in the complaint. I respect these farmers as colleagues and recognize their efforts on their farms and for their organization. I do not question their honesty or the genuineness of their views as expressed in their declarations; however, since DFA and DMS have chosen not to open the record of the case and keep the vast majority of the evidence confidential, the declarants' opinions are uninformed by this

I remain convinced that the declarants' 1 evidence. 2 position, in addition to the bias and incomplete information they have received from the management of 3 DFA and DMS, taints their objectivity." 4 5 You will note, your Honor, that actually in -- with 6 regards to the opposition, the vast majority of farmers 7 are actually the defendants. They're members of the 8 board of DMS we have heard from and, in addition, 9 politicians. You have in front of you today the classic dairy 10 problem. You have bankers, lawyers and politicians and 11 12 processors, which I touch on all that in my -- in my writing, standing before you telling you what dairy 13 14 farmers need. And I'm encouraging you to listen to the 15 actual dairy farmers that are not delegates of the 16 organization. As far as I know, these --17 I will leave it there. Thank you. 18 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. 19 David Galley. 20 DAVID GALLEY: Good morning, your Honor. 21 THE COURT: Good morning. 22 DAVID GALLEY: Thank you for the opportunity 23 to speak. 24 THE COURT: Would you just spell your last

25

name.

Yes, good.

Along with my wife, Kathy, and my daughter, Sonya, we comprise Silver Spoon Dairy, LLC, of Garrattsville, New York. We formed an LLC with our daughter three years ago, three years after she graduated from Virginia Tech and worked elsewhere. She has a keen interest in dairy cattle and has demonstrated a commitment to the future of our home farm.

We milk about 70 cows, ship roughly two million pounds of milk a year. Registered holstein herd, 26,000 pound herd average. We raise all our own forage, high-moisture corn as well as all replacement animals. Through a comprehensive nutrient management plans and precision feeding, we strive to employ the best management practices available.

In addition to our farm business, my family and I are very active in our community. I serve as an elder in our church, vice chairman of the town planning board in addition to serving as the secretary of South New Berlin Cooperative in South New Berlin, New York.

My wife is also active in church, 4-H county, the state holstein groups, and our daughter is music director of the church and very active in 4-H, Holstein Association and dog agility training and competition.

To demonstrate my perspective, I would like to give you some background on how I have grown through the dairy industry.

I began shipping milk in 1967, nearly 50 years ago, through a small local co-op called Rock Royal Co-op, which was affiliated with Net-co. 1972 I moved to my current location and joined Dairylea.

In the early '80s, there were independent handlers aggressively canvassing for milk, and so I left Dairylea and became an independent for a number of years.

1986, myself and a group of four others organized the group co-op of 35 producers. Our goal was to offer a buyer consistent supply of quality milk located in a geographic close and easily accessible area. We were very successful in obtaining over-order pricing and a secure market for our milk.

We became affiliated with Allied Federated

Cooperatives in Canton, and as president of Butternut

Milk Group I served on the Allied board of directors.

In early 2001, our group, along with South New Berlin and some others, lost confidence in Allied management. When our concerns were not addressed, Butter Milk Group and South New Berlin both left Allied. At the time, we dissolved the Butternut Milk Group, and most of us joined the South New Berlin group. I was

appointed to the board of directors, elected to serve as secretary, which I still am today.

During my time in both groups, I have been involved in contract negotiations with handlers, and when we left Allied, that is the South New Berlin group, we were able to negotiate a successful three-year contract with a large handler. We were not able to renew that contract at the end of three years, but we were able to, through DMS, market the milk through them with the same terms with a five-year contract. That was the beginning of our marketing agreement with DMS, and the co-op has remained with them today.

South New Berlin is an independent group that hires its own fieldmen, general manager and hauler, with contracts with DMS for a producer payroll.

During my tenure on the executive committee of South New Berlin, I have been involved in all negotiations and matters with DFA. We meet with the DFA representatives at least annually, or more often if either party feels there's a need. All matters have always been settled in a way that have been equitable and in the best interests of both parties. We are very concerned about having a stable market for our milk, and DFA's been able to provide that stability. Milk marketing is much more complex than it was 30 years ago

when we organized our first small group. South New Berlin is an example of successfully working together with DMS/DFA, and in today's milk-marketing climate, we don't feel that we are in a position to negotiate with large processing facilities nor to be on top of day-to-day handling of loads of milk. We need the expertise and strength of a group like DMS/DFA to provide our marketing arm.

Much has been brought to light through the Northeast settlement, and February 15th, 2016, our board of directors sent a letter to the U.S. District Court supporting the settlement and asking to expedite the decision. The letter was sent clearly to indicate our position of South New Berlin Cooperative, and that letter, as well as our attendance today, is our initiative and demonstrate our support.

My cost of being here today is expensive. Getting our corn planted and beginning hay crop harvest determines the blueprint of our success the next 12 months. Right now today would be a good time to be planting corn. Eric Lindberg, our cooperative president, is here with me today, I think indicates how valuable we feel the settlement is and that it should be completed. And we are here with full board support.

As an industry, dairymen and DFA need to move past

this, settle and strengthen our position to survive the current milk crisis. Our South New Berlin Coop president, Eric Lindberg, and I have met with each of the board members and have their documented unanimous support in this position.

We think the people that have been appointed by the Court to be involved with DFA and the settlement can only bring good things to light: more people, more ideas, more integrity.

I thank you for the opportunity to speak again, and I hope this brings a different perspective than many others have. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Larry Burgin.

LARRY BURGIN: Good morning, your Honor.

THE COURT: Good morning.

LARRY BURGIN: And thank you for the opportunity to speak today.

My name is Larry Burgin. That's L-a-r-ry
B-u-r-g-i-n. I am a dairy farmer from Delhi, New York.
Our farm, Mushkoday Farm, is a family business with my sons Jacob and John being the fifth generation to be part of the farm. It started in 1908 by my great-grandparents, John and Jessie Burgin. They milked about a dozen cows.

Since that time our dairy has seen tremendous change. Today we are currently milking around 160 cows, producing well over three million pounds of raw milk annually. We also utilize some of the latest dairy production technology utilizing robotics. It is inspiring for me to work on a farm and a family business with three generations working together as my father of 80 years of age is still integrally involved with the daily activities of the farm.

It has been a privilege for me to be involved in the dairy industry here in the Northeast for the last 36 years. It has given my wife and myself the opportunity to raise our five children in a rural, agricultural environment in which they had daily activity -- or daily responsibilities and activities. This, I believe, is something that has benefited them greatly as they have grown into adulthood.

My wife, Ann, after our children have grown, is currently a full-time substitute teacher at South Kortright Central School. I serve on the New York City Water Shed Agricultural Council board of directors. We are also parishioners at St. Ann's Roman Catholic Church in Andes, New York.

I wholeheartedly believe in the value of cooperatives. My family has belonged to a cooperative

for almost a hundred years. My great-grandfather joined Dairylea as a member in 1929. I also credit our farm's relative success to the united practices of a cooperative, and I believe that DFA and DMS are committed to marketing our milk every day of the year.

Becoming a Dairylea member myself in 1980, I quickly realized the value of being part of a cooperative as a great way to become informed and educated on the milk industry here in the Northeast.

That being said, I always made it a point to develop a relationship with my director and asked them lots of questions.

In these last 36 years, I have never asked any questions that I did not have answered to -- to my satisfaction. I can unequivocally say that as a member and a delegate, being part of the -- part of Dairylea, and now DFA, I was privy many times to the decisions that the board of directors and the management team made, and I can also unequivocally say that those members' interests and those of the entire industry here in the Northeast were always at the forefront of all their business dealings.

I firmly believe there was no wrongdoing by DFA and DMS at all. The management of the cooperative always has the best interests of the members as well as the

entire Northeast dairy industry in the front of their mind. As such, I believe that by this settlement, it will allow DFA to put this lawsuit behind them and move forward to seek new business opportunities that will provide better returns for the members as well as strengthening the milk-marketing environment here in the Northeast for all of us.

In my opinion, we face some very difficult marketing and pricing issues here in the Northeast, and we need to, as farmers, utilize our cooperatives and work closely with them now at all times to improve returns back to the farm. There is an acronym that we have all heard before and that is TEAM -- together everyone achieves more.

A good friend of mine worked tirelessly his whole adult life to build bridges between people. He always told me that it was better for everyone involved to build bridges rather than to tear one down. In my experience in this industry, when we all work together as dairy farmers, members of a cooperative, we can do a better job marketing our milk, hauling it more efficiently, and obtaining greater returns back to the farm. This is one of the reasons why I support the proposed settlement of this case.

I am very aware that some farmers oppose this

settlement and believe that having a trial will solve all of their problems. To me, a trial is pointless when you consider all of the intricate details of milk marketing that would have to be discussed in court. Going to trial will not create new markets. It will not obtain better pricing, and it will not reduce our hauling costs. If this lawsuit continues, it will only breed more animosity amongst dairy farmers here in the Northeast and deny farmers the benefit of this settlement.

A while ago I heard someone say that when one segment of agriculture says something derogatory about another segment of agriculture, nobody wins. Everybody loses. If we as farmers continue to argue amongst ourselves, we will continue to receive less than potential that is available. I support the proposed settlement and recommend that the dairy industry work together as a team to bring about real and positive changes. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Patty Bikowsky.

PATTY BIKOWSKY: It's Patty Bikowsky,
P-a-t-t-y B-i-k-o-w-s-k-y.

My husband and I are dairy farmers on a farm in Madison, New York. We milk about 80 cows. We have

raised our family there. They have chosen to do other professions but still love to come back to the farm.

I currently serve as a council member for the Northeast Dairy -- DFA -- Area Council. I have been in that role for about 10 years. Additionally, I serve on the New York Beef Council, the National Cattleman's Beef Board, and also the American Dairy Association and Dairy Council Promotion Board.

I feel very strongly that the co-op is the way to go for farmers to work together. 25 years ago I was an independent. Farmers like to be known as independent themselves. They like to run their own business. They like to be their own boss. And here I was handing my milk to an independent person who could do whatever he wanted, make the profits he wanted, and the more I thought about a co-op, the more I thought this is the way I want to go because then I can have control. I can have a say in how the business is run.

So I joined the co-op, became a member. Soon realized I wanted to take a more active role, so I became part of the resolutions committee. That's the part that farmers -- any farmers can bring any issues, any problems, any changes that they want to a resolutions member. The resolutions committee gets together, discusses it, decides what -- what they want

for their co-op, and that is passed and becomes part of the resolutions book. So it is definitely a grass-roots effort. I love that part of it.

When I had the opportunity to become -- to run as a director, I jumped right at it. I kind of like to have a say in things, and I like to speak my peace, but I like to also understand how things are run.

I'm unique as I stand here because I'm the council member that represents the district that Jonathan and Claudia Haar reside in. I take my role seriously, and the first time I met them was at -- we have summer picnics and fall district meetings, and I met them there. They seemed to be very interested in the co-op. We had a long discussion. They said that they would like to run as delegates, and I said, "Well, I can get the information for you how to do it."

So in a return phone call I talked to them about how to become a delegate. You can nominate yourself.

You can nominate somebody else. And then you -- as long as the person that you nominated accepts it, you become -- you are on the ballot and you can run for any of the elected positions.

I expected that the Haars would do that at the next election which was the next year, but they chose not to, which surprised me.

So I have made sure that any member I speak to has that opportunity to become a representative, and if they don't want to, if they want to call me and get information -- there are newsletters sent out. We try to be transparent in everything. We -- there's no hidden secrets at our board meetings. Some things are in executive session, but anything that pertains to the members that will help them out, we go out of our way to give that information.

I think this settlement will do an even better job, though, with the two representatives that are -- you were talking about. Perhaps somebody doesn't get along with their council member and they feel more comfortable talking to someone else. This will give them another outlet, but it is all about transparency and representation. Frankly, sometimes I don't even get enough people to fill my delegates' positions, and I have to beg people to do this, but farmers are busy. Like they say, we should all be planting corn, but we felt it was important to come here and to speak and encourage you to do the settlement as it stands.

I think that this has gone on for so long, it has hindered DFA's ability to work on behalf of the members effectively. It's taken management time and energy away from productive business that could actually help all

farmers. It's made it harder for farmers to work together, and in today's milk-marketing environment, we need to all work together instead of against each other. So I urge you to please settle the lawsuit. It needs to end, and we all need to get back to focusing on the things that matter: working together to improve the livelihood of all dairy farmers. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you.

William S. Moody.

WILLIAM MOODY: Good morning, your Honor.

I am William S. Moody, W-i-l-l-i-a-m S. M-o-o-d-y.

My family and I live in Delaware County, New York.

I am here to support the settlement of the case of Allen versus the Dairy Farmers of America.

Our family has used cooperatives for many years, ever since my grandfather joined Dairymen's League in the mid 1920s, and we felt that's the best way to market our milk. We are currently members of Dairy Farmers of America and have been since our former cooperative joined with DFA.

We milk 60 cows on a grass-based system and it works very well for us. Our family of three children grew up on our dairy and are still involved in the dairy industry. My daughter currently owns part of our dairy farm and has cows in it, and we hope to continue the

fourth generation on our farm.

Because of the small size of our dairy, we depend very heavily on DFA to provide us with services such as marketing our milk, getting us a fair price for our milk, guaranteeing payment for our milk, and providing us with many extra support services to lower the cost for our farm.

DFA is a dairy farmer-owned cooperative. All members have equity in DFA, and to continue this lawsuit has the chance of costing the farmer members millions of dollars against the equity in DFA. This is one of the reasons that I am supporting this current settlement.

I feel that DFA has always worked in my best interests. I have attended many local meetings to get information and also to vote for DFA delegates and directors at our local meetings. The ballots are passed out at our local meetings and counted by dairy farmer members in a fair manner so that everybody that has wanted to be a delegate or run for director of DFA has gotten to do so.

I have actually been a participant in the process of counting these ballots for different districts so that I really don't know any of the members that were running, and I can say that the directors and delegates are all fairly elected by their farmer members.

I attended expanded Northeast board meetings where fairly large groups of farmers can get together and discuss any matter that -- of interest and actually interact with the directors and the staff of Northeast DHI -- or Northeast Dairy Farmers of America.

I have been a national delegate and attended 13 of our 17 annual meetings and voted for corporate directors. I am also a large user of DairyOne services for the technology they offer and believe they have a great deal of integrity. I have used DairyOne and the former Northeast DHI for over 40 years to test my milk and to provide me with management advice for my dairy.

I believe their milk-testing services are the best in the dairy business and work with a great deal of integrity. My milk check has always been very clear to me, and all of the deductions and premiums that I received are broken down and explained on every milk check. And as to that point, for the last several years, I have received an over-order premium based on the quality of my milk, on not using rSBT {sic} on my cows, and this has been a substantial -- on a small dairy like ours, this has been a substantial extra income for us.

I believe that this settlement is good and it will provide extra oversight. Our board and our council have

fairly large numbers of farms and another person will only add to the benefit of having an extra person take a look at the business we do and offer up advice.

I believe the ombudsman will be a positive thing for many of the people that really don't understand all of the things that are going on in our dairy cooperative.

For all these reasons, I believe this settlement should be finalized now. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Lisa Knapton. Lisa Knapton. No?

LISA KNAPTON. Lisa Knapton, K-n-a-p-t-o-n.

I am a first-generation dairy farmer from New Hampshire. I've raised my family -- excuse my voice. I'm nervous -- raised my family on the farm there.

I wrote a letter in support of the settlement.

Although I understand the arguments of the other side and the frustration, and -- I think from a first-generation farmer perspective, we -- we're planting genetically modified plants. We are using genomics to breed our animals. We are milking our cows with robotics. But we aren't looking at our market price, which is driven in part by policies which were written in the '30s. And I see this case as a beginning.

Instead of looking back, I think we should be 1 2 looking forward at reform, and I see this as a step in the right direction. And that's all I have to say. 3 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. 4 5 Reynard Hunt. 6 REYNARD HUNT: Good morning. 7 THE COURT: Good morning. 8 REYNARD HUNT: It's Reynard, R-e-y-n-a-r-d 9 H-u-n-t. AUDIENCE MEMBER: Please speak into the mic. 10 REYNARD HUNT: And I am a subclass 11 12 representative for DFA and DMS subclass. I support the 13 proposed settlement in this case. 14 I grew up on a dairy farm in New Jersey that had 15 been in the family since before the American Revolution. 16 From the time we sold our herd early -- in the early '70s, I have raised dairy replacement heifers and 17 18 still do so today, and I do some crop farming. 19 I was a physical education teacher for 35 years, 20 and then I co-founded Spring House Dairy with Peter 21 Southway in 2003. During that time, we kept 22 approximately 95 head of dairy cattle, and beginning in 23 around 2005, we started selling most of the milk through 24 DMS. 25 After selling my interest in the Spring House Dairy

in 2011, I operated my own dairy herd until August 2013, milked approximately 50 cows, and sold the milk through DMS.

I -- as a class representative, I took my role very seriously, evaluated the litigation and settlement to the best of my abilities. I had quite a few discussions with local farmers and some farmers out of the area, and as most everybody agreed, it's not a perfect settlement but most were in agreement that it was a good settlement and it was necessary to make this settlement.

Weighing the risks of trial and appeals versus what farmers are certainly receiving from this settlement, concluded that the settlement was the best choice. The main decision was between continuing to fight the defendants and head to trial or whether negotiate a settlement, and I think the latter is the best course. The settlement disregards -- resulted from these negotiations is I think a good one, in my estimation, and it's a good compromise for both sides.

THE COURT: Thank you. We'll have one more before the morning, and that -- I mean before our lunch break, and that will be Tim Maxham.

TIMOTHY MAXHAM: Good morning, your Honor.

THE COURT: Good morning.

TIMOTHY MAXHAM: I guess we're about

halfway through, and there's some other members from St.

Albans Co-op that are going to be after me, but luckily
they get a chance to have a break before they come up.

THE COURT: So let's just have your spelling of your last name for the record.

TIMOTHY MAXHAM: Yes. Timothy Maxham, $\label{eq:maxham} \text{M-a-x-h-a-m}.$

THE COURT: Thank you.

TIMOTHY MAXHAM: I am going to briefly go back roughly a hundred years just to say St. Albans Co-op, up in St. Albans, Vermont, was created back in 1919. In the year 1920, my mother was born, and it was stated earlier this morning, you know, number of farms. There are roughly 25,000 farms in the state of Vermont. By the year 1950, we were down to 15,000 farms, and today, in the year 2016, Vermont farmers are -- roughly approximately 850 of us. And so, you know, we all know what's happening, but yet we are still producing food and fiber around the country for expanded population. We have our trials and tribulations, and we're addressing one of those here today.

It's been a long process, and I'm here to speak in favor of the settlement. I think it's gone on long enough. It wasn't settled completely the first time around, and there has been stated earlier there have

been updates to that to make more protection for some of the people that were looking and considered some inequities in the market system and how we operate.

I have seen a lot of changes since I was born in 1953, and I was born on a small dairy farm in Morrisville, Vermont, and I think I had milk in my blood veins because it's all I ever wanted to do was be a dairy farmer.

In the late '50s, you know, a lot of changes that we have seen progress, and it started, you know, it -- I can still remember my mother and father milking into the milk cans. And about the late 1950s there was a push, United Farmers Co-op, I believe at the time we were involved with, you know, bulk tanks and updating. We did put in a bulk tank at that time. I remember, you know, remodeling the farm, probably a couple old horse stalls that we took out and put in a bulk tank.

Unfortunately, two or three years later, cows were sold. I didn't have anything to say about it. But that's the way it goes. We seen that attrition, and we can't say the marketplace has always driven it, you know. It's been other things that made the economics unviable for farmers to continue or they reached an age and they couldn't pass it on, as some people have stated here, that they have — the farm has gone, come down in

the family in generations.

So I lost my opportunity to farm the family farm.

My parents and I, and my other siblings, moved to South

Hero, which is in Grand Isle County, on beautiful Lake

Champlain, just 25 miles away from here, in 1966.

In 1967, at the age of 13, I started working for a neighbor farm and worked there for 10 years through high school, put myself through two years of tech college at Vermont -- VTC in Randolph, went back to the farm and continued working there until 1977, and I decided it was time to stretch out and operate it myself.

There was a neighbor farm that had gone out earlier and barn was vacant. I asked him if I could rent the place, and so I'm coming up on the anniversary Memorial Day weekend 1977. I was a member of the St. Albans Co-op. I paid my dollar to buy a share, and I became an operating member of St. Albans Co-op.

Over the years, we have seen things continually change. Shortly previous to that, Grand Isle -- several towns, Grand Isle Creamery, they decided to disband or join with St. Albans Co-op. They did so. Shortly after that, there were some other smaller co-ops that decided that they needed to make a change, and they changed and joined with St. Albans Co-op.

Over the years we saw some membership grow. St.

Albans Co-op basically was just Franklin County. Now we have members in New Hampshire, all of northern Vermont, and some over in New York. We have had to expand to stay viable and offer the services for the farmers to compete and market their milk.

One of the reasons that I think it's time for the settlement to be made and continue on, as has been expressed earlier here, you know, I kind of get up in the morning and there's only so much I can do in a 24-hour period. Sometimes it's kind of cut and dried; other times we have issues that we want to take care of and certain circumstances that come about that it just doesn't allow it. You're out making hay and it rains, you're all done. We talked about planting corn. We don't usually get it done in a day, but we usually get it done. But when something like this has taken this long -- and we all know that the wheels of justice sometimes turn slow, and we need to continue and move on and look forward, and one of the things -- a couple of things: Why am I a co-op member?

I guess at the time it probably -- there weren't too many alternatives, but I have been a strong supporter of the co-op ever since I joined. I know my board of directors. I know management. I am only 30 miles away from the plant. I don't have to worry about

marketing my milk. It's taken care of. I receive a milk check. As talked about, we receive premiums on qualities and that type of thing. And I just want to relate that balancing milk and taking care of it, you know, 365 days a years, individually I can't do that, and I know the runnings of co-op and marketing milk and taking care of a perishable product. When a lot of times our customer, the co-op customer, is closed for the weekend or long holidays, the use of milk goes down, somehow that product is taken care of.

And we have a co-op member in Lamoille County, in the town of Morrisville where I was born. They operate a -- probably a small, medium-sized farm, but they have personally gotten into value-added product. They produce cheese on the farm. And talking with a fellow there one day, he says, "Well, we probably produce cheese two or three days a week. We probably take 600 pounds of milk." I don't know how much milk they are milking, but -- or making, but they have to have an avenue for the rest of that product. They don't have to worry about it because the milk truck is picking up their milk every day. They're able to do what they want to do in trying to create a market for small amount of it, make a value-added product and make some extra income.

THE COURT: So we are right about at your time. A couple last thoughts?

TIMOTHY MAXHAM: Okay. The other thing is that I have been involved in town government for a long time. Your Honor, you're familiar with Vermont so, you know, town meeting. I have been town moderator for 30 years in the town of South Hero, and there's only so much business we can take care of in a day. We have an agenda, and we take care of things. And also, we operate on Roberts Rules of Order, and, you know, some questions, they require larger percentage to move on to certain things, and some of those, you know, require two-thirds vote consideration.

As I understand it, we had six plaintiffs. It was increased to nine. We have six of those that are in favor of the settlement. We are at that magic number of two-thirds. Let's settle the question and move on to greater things and look forward to the future. Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

We will take our noon break at this time, and we'll come back at one o'clock. You shouldn't leave things in the courtroom when you exit, and I understand Clement Gervais might have to leave early, so you are actually number four when we come back, so I think we should be

able to get to you, but you might want to talk to the 1 2 people ahead of you if that isn't going to work for you. And anything from counsel before we take our break? 3 MR. PIERSON: No, your Honor. Thank you. 4 5 MR. KUNEY: Not here, your Honor. 6 (Court was in recess at 12:00 p.m.) 7 (The following was held in open court at 1:10 p.m.) 8 THE COURT: We are back on the record in Alice 9 Allen versus Dairy Farmers of America, and we are in our 10 fairness hearing. And the next speaker is Patrick 11 Howrigan. 12 PATRICK HOWRIGAN: You want the spelling on 13 the name? 14 THE COURT: Yes, please. 15 PATRICK HOWRIGAN: H-o-w-r-i-q-a-n. 16 Good afternoon. THE COURT: Good afternoon. 17 18 PATRICK HOWRIGAN: My name is Patrick 19 Howrigan. My wife, Paula, and I have been proud members 20 of the St. Albans Co-op since 1977. My two sons 21 represent seventh-generation dairymen in Franklin 22 County, Vermont. 23 I believe that myself and my fellow dairymen can 24 accomplish more when we work together than we can 25 working alone. Our board of directors, management and

staff are open, accessible and helpful to explain if we have any concerns. I am confident that when our directors put their boots on in the morning, they face the same concerns for their families and farm management as we do.

St. Albans Co-op has a long tradition of helping membership with financial programs to assist with purchasing supplies like fertilizer, seed, feed, and storage supplies. These programs are available to all members and we can all benefit.

When St. Albans Co-op became members of Dairy

Farmers of America and DMS, it was a good move for our

patrons. We now have the benefit of financial strength

that we can deal with larger customers. We can work

together to service markets that would have been beyond

our reach. We now have hauling advantages that can help

produce premiums for our membership. DMS has the

ability to send the closest milk available to the

nearest market. Instead of competing relationships for

market share, we now work together to benefit us, the

farmer owners.

We at St. Albans have made a major financial investment in our production facilities. We now have the capacity to service milk in the Northeast while also contributing as team players. Our relationship with DFA

and DMS requires major trust of all involved. The settlement in Allen versus Dairy Farmers of America is good for all. This settlement provides a structure to protect and guard this trust. It will protect and provide a solid voice for our member dairy farmers. The settlement will provide the legal outline to solve problems and build trust as we move forward. I support the settlement. I would believe it will be good for our family and good for my fellow dairymen.

I feel the Court did a good job of explaining the new aspects of the settlement which includes significant elements that could really benefit the dairy industry. The concept of having a farmer ombudsman is very compelling to me. It could go a long way in giving dairy farmers a new type of mediation mechanism as well as additional peace of mind that DFA and DMS are conducting business in the best interests of the dairy farmer members.

The advisory council member will also provide benefit. There will be an additional advocate for farmers and through this role could suggest new ideas to DFA and DMS to improve dairy farmers' bottom line.

Overall, these new positions will go a long way in demonstrating and verifying transparency and respect within DFA and DMS.

In addition to the new positions listed above there and other benefits to the settlement agreement, the financial-disclosure and milk-testing provisions should provide additional assurance to dairy farmers.

Finally, I believe the theme of this settlement is to continue to grow trust and respect between DFA/DMS and the dairy farmer members. All the protections included in the settlement go a long way towards achieving that goal. I feel it is time to enforce the settlement and allow it to be the voice of trust and protection for our dairy farmers. This settlement gives us the tool box to protect and enhance that trust. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Bill Rowell.

BILL ROWELL: Good afternoon, your Honor.

THE COURT: Afternoon.

BILL ROWELL: My name is Bill Rowell,

R-o-w-e-l-l.

My brother, Ryan, and I operate Green Mountain

Dairy Farm in Franklin County, Vermont. We are members

of the St. Albans Cooperative Creamery. We milk 950

cows and receive quality awards for the milk we produce.

Last year our production exceeded 27 million pounds.

In an effort to raise the bar for agriculture, we

have hosted tours of our farm and digesture operation for more than 22,000 visitors over the past several years. Our objective is to educate the consumer, show them where their food comes from, let them observe the routine practices on today's farm, and see firsthand how cattle are housed, fed and cared for. It's been a big success.

This August we will host Vermont Breakfast on the Farm, an event sponsored by the Agency of Agriculture and the University Extension Service. I have been on the state board of advisers for University Extension for the past six years. We are told to expect a crowd of more than 1,000 people. Yet here today I can see those efforts being overshadowed by negative press. This disturbs me. It comes as a detriment to the image of the dairy industry that we are trying to improve and to our livelihood and every farmer here.

I believe that settling this matter would be in everyone's better interests. I did attend the previous two hearings. I would note that your seating in here is much more comfortable with the cushions.

One of the two key words here today is cooperation. The milk market is highly sensitive to pricing, product quality, consumer confidence and/or public trust.

Presently U.S. agriculture finds itself at a real

disadvantage in the global marketplace. The strength of the U.S. dollar alone creates an obstacle for competitive sales.

In addition, the supply of milk currently exceeds market demand. As a result, milk is being dumped for land application, another negative image for our industry.

The proposed requirement of introducing new positions, ombudsman and advisory council member as part of DFA's counsel, I find that to be highly positive and it does several things of import. First, it serves to improve clarity by offering a direct link to information. Second, it creates a means of mediation to resolve issues before they become a tumultuous problem. Third, and key to the entire process, serves to increase transparency.

I would also note that transparency lays bare the responsibility of all parties involved, not just that of the cooperative itself. St. Albans and DFA have achieved a good working relationship over the years, something which has increased benefits to both cooperatives and their producer members. I would like to see this relationship continue.

As members, we currently enjoy programs which otherwise might not exist. There are a number of

examples. One is that of collaborating for market milk and maximize premiums rather than compete with each other for the markets. Another recognizes transportation efficiencies.

Since the revised settlement was served to promote a good working relationship between the cooperative and its producer members, I am hopeful that a settlement agreement can be reached today. While some may think it fitting for the big corporation to pay, and by doing so find that it serves justice, they would be failing to recognize this as a burden shouldered by farmers, the producer members of the cooperative.

\$50 million settlement, there's no doubt that it will take time for the industry to get beyond the negative press resulting from this action. Therefore, I ask that you end it today and allow that work to begin.

My family has been in agriculture in this country since 1637, and we have had to cooperate to get here today. We're going to have to cooperate to move forward tomorrow. Let's get started.

THE COURT: Thank you.

BILL ROWELL: Thank you.

THE COURT: Wayne Hurtubise.

WAYNE HURTUBISE: Thank you, your Honor, for allowing me to speak. My name is Wayne Hurtubise,

H-u-r-t-u-b-i-s-e.

I own and operate a dairy farm in Richford,

Vermont, which is in Franklin County, with my two

brothers, a son, and nephews, which are the fourth

generation on this farm. We milk 800 cows. We market

24 million pounds of milk a year. We have been a member

of St. Albans Co-op since 1982, which is a

member-governed cooperative committed to providing

service, stable markets, and the greatest return in

profits to our members.

I am here today on my own accord to explain why I am in support of the Northeast Dairy lawsuit settlement. Working with DFA/DMS gives the St. Albans Co-op members security -- security, excuse me, with large milk customers in maximizing premiums versus competing for markets against them.

The key aspects about this settlement are:

The farmer ombudsperson who will listen and investigate any farmer's disputes between DFA and DMS.

An advisory council member, which will allow -- which will -- excuse me, advocate for farmers with DFA and DMS and promote better pay prices, net income, and enhance equity for them.

Milk tested. For the next 10 years, DFA and DMS will not acquire a controlling interest in the

milk-testing company its farmers use, which is DairyOne.

In addition, any concerns regarding milk-testing

accuracy will be brought forth to the farmer

ombudsperson who will attempt to mediate any disputes.

Adulterated milk, which is farmer's milk found unacceptable for milk processing plants. DFA and DMS will notify the affected farmer within three hours. At farmer's request, testing will be done at an independent laboratory.

These provisions are all changes from the original settlement which will provide added assurance that DFA and DMS are serving in the best interests of their members.

In closing, it would take a considerable amount of time for me to explain all the benefits and member programs that has helped our farm in the 36 years we have been with the St. Albans Co-op. I believe that this settlement is fair and see no need to go to trial. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Clement Gervais.

CLEMENT GERVAIS: Thank you. My name is Clement Gervais, G-e-r-v-a-i-s, and I am in support of the settlement.

I farm in Bakersfield, Vermont, with three

brothers, one niece, and my parents. My family milks around 1800 cows which produce approximately 50 million pounds of milk a year. My father started farming in Bakersfield in 1960, and in 2013 we had the honor of being named Vermont Dairy Farm of the Year.

I am a member of the -- I am a member of the independent St. Albans Cooperative Creamery and have been for over 30 years. There are a few reasons I choose to ship my milk to St. Albans Co-op. I have always enjoyed the transparency of our co-op. My family has always been able to talk to the staff, the CEO, or any of the farmer directors whenever we need to. One example of this is any time our farm has had questions about a quality test or solids test that could affect our pay price, staff has always listened to our concerns and retested to ensure accuracy.

Oftentimes my busy schedule does not allow me or many other farmers to be involved or kept up to date on important issues. The St. Albans Co-op has always been a consistent and fair voice for its farmers. Whether it is for rule or policy changes in our industry or any potential concerns for its farmers, I have always appreciated this fair representation.

The St. Albans Co-op is absolutely essential to my family's success at producing and selling milk. I rely

on my co-op to market my milk and to do so profitably. Milk co-ops are farmer owned so if we do not find a profitable home to our milk, then all of its farmers lose money.

St. Albans has worked with DFA and DMS to gain efficiencies in the collection, handling and balancing of our milk. This relationship is a positive one to gain trucking efficiencies as well as improving the balancing of our milk. At times such as now, when our milk shed has extra milk, we do not undercut each other to find a home. That would only lower the sell price more hurting what the dairy farmers actually get paid.

I would like to mention a few of the reasons I support this settlement. I really like the idea of adding a farmer ombudsperson. This will give more trust, transparency, as well as a way to improve communications. The advisory council member will also create a valuable mechanism to mediate any concerns.

I feel the settlement is not an end; it is the beginning of better communication that will benefit all the farmers. I also like the new milk-testing provisions. All farmers get paid according to the fat and protein tests of our milk. Additional testing will help ensure that our farmers are getting paid fairly.

Another reason for supporting this settlement is to

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

secure my co-op's financial responsibilities. In the last couple of years, I have been part of the St. Albans Co-op equity committee. Part of this committee's responsibility is to make sure the co-op has a strong equity position. This will enable us to grow or diversify when it's profitable for its farmers. St. Albans' financial responsibility for paying forth this settlement is an unknown amount unless the settlement is approved. The last reason for supporting this settlement is to avoid additional attorneys' fees. If not settled, the extra costs for attorneys will only hurt all farmers. It's time to settle this lawsuit so we can concentrate on the many important financial needs to ensure a strong co-op and successful farmers in it. I want to thank you for your time and the opportunity to speak today and hope you consider my views to approve this settlement. THE COURT: Thank you. Paul Stanley. PAUL STANLEY: Good afternoon. THE COURT: Good afternoon. PAUL STANLEY: My name is Paul Stanley, P-a-u-l S-t-a-n-l-e-y. And, your Honor, I know that I cannot wear a hat in

this courtroom, but I would like to use this as a prop because any good farmer, dairy farmer, cannot go out of the barn without his hat. And I'd also like to add and point out that there's a Jersey cow on this hat. She is one of the nine million plus cows that we have in this country, and I believe, and my colleagues know what I'm going to say, with St. Albans Co-op, that what she produces represents what we need to be producing to sell our product and get out of the bind that we're in with our surplus, and that is high components in our dairy products.

And getting to the reason that we're here today:

I, like Clement, live in Bakersfield, Vermont, with my
wife, who runs a 30-cow dairy farm with my daughter, who
works off the farm; and our 60 registered Jersey and
heifers produce a high-component milk that is shipped to
St. Albans Cooperative Creamery, which we have done
since our dairy was established in 1985.

Paulin Dairy was designed to operate with an off-farm income, which dairies of this size typically must rely on. One of my off-farm incomes was acting as a dairy inspector with the State of Massachusetts, giving me much insight into the fluid milk marketing in the Northeast Federal Market Order.

The lawsuit of Allen versus Dairy Farmers of

America, Dairy Marketing Service, needs to be settled, period. And I repeat, it needs to be settled. And, your Honor, in listening to the comments, we always have a take-home message, and I hope that the take-home message that you are hearing today from the folks that are testifying is the settlement of this suit.

As the suit drags on, it is also dragging our milk-marketing abilities down with it. It is essentially a fight among dairy farmers for a fluid market we no longer have in the Northeast Order. This has pushed more of the milk produced into this order, to the Class IV milk powder market, which is very low return to the dairy industry and is only a place to dispose of milk we do not have a market for in the Northeast or the U.S. This pushes the milk plant capacity to the point where milk has to be disposed of in our on-farm nutrient cycling systems.

The settlement of this lawsuit would allow St.

Albans Cooperative and the rest of the Northeast, the national milk market, to move forward with some innovative, out-of-the-box ways to market our milk.

If only half the time and money that has been spent on this lawsuit were put toward marketing and promoting our dairy products, we would not have the oversupply of milk that we have in the marketplace today. Instead, we

would have healthier people living on a healthier 1 2 planet. Thank you for your time and consideration. 3 4 THE COURT: Thank you. 5 Bryan Davis. 6 BRYAN DAVIS: Good afternoon, your Honor. 7 THE COURT: Good afternoon. 8 BRYAN DAVIS: My name is Bryan Davis, 9 B-r-y-a-n D-a-v-i-s. I want to start off by thanking you for giving me 10 the opportunity to testify in your courtroom today. 11 12 have never testified in court before, or anywhere else, 13 as a matter of fact, so please bear with me. 14 Our farm is located in Derby, Vermont, which is 15 located directly on the Canadian border in northern 16 That part of the state is also referred to as 17 the Northeast Kingdom. I farm with my wife, a son, 18 daughter-in-law, and I just had my first grandson born 19 five months ago. He will be the fourth generation on 20 our farm. 21 We milk 135 cows and produce about three million 22 pounds of milk a year. We also raise the same number of 23 replacement stock. We also tap 4500 maple trees, and 24 we're just coming off the best season we have ever had

in the 60-year history of our maple business.

25

I have read the proposed settlement, and I want to thank all the parties involved. You can tell they put a tremendous amount of faith, effort and thought into it.

Almost 40 years ago my father and mother helped me buy the neighbor's farm. My dad was always a member of a co-op. He was even a director for Cabot Creamery for 15 years before Agri-Mark bought the co-op. I have been a co-op member myself for my entire farming career, first at Cabot and now at St. Albans. I switched to St. Albans because I thought they were very transparent and that the CEO and management team were only a phone call away.

I was very fortunate 20 years ago. I was elected a director of St. Albans Co-op. It's a position I still hold. I believe co-ops are a very important part of our industry. I belong to a co-op because it allows me to sleep better at night knowing my milk is going to be picked up in the morning and that I'm going to receive a fair price for it. I feel if I was an independent producer and shipped directly to Dean Foods or Hood, I would wonder and worry that I might receive a phone call saying that they wouldn't need my milk this coming weekend or over an upcoming holiday.

Back in the '80s, St. Albans Co-op was very instrumental, along with others in the industry, in

establishing the Northeast Dairy Compact. It was a pricing formula to help us with low prices that we were receiving back then. It worked, and it was the envy of many other parts of the country.

My question was, did Dean Foods or Hood help us get that pricing formula? They did not. It was co-ops made of dairy farmers, and that's what helped us get that Northeast Dairy Compact.

Quick comment regarding the component the milk-testing sampling in the settlement. I have been on the quality committee at the co-op, you know, St. Albans Co-op, since I was elected, and I'm now chairman of the quality committee, and all of those years I can only remember two or three times where a member had a complaint about milk testing, and once we brought those producers to the table to meet with our quality committee and the lab technicians, we didn't hear another peep out of 'em. We just needed to get them in to the office, and we needed to educate 'em; just needed to get 'em off the farm and educate them about the process.

St. Albans Co-op has been a partner with DFA and DMS for many years now. I believe the partnership has worked very well and has benefited the membership of both organizations. I think this lawsuit has been a sad

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

chapter in the lives of dairy farmers. It has pitted dairy farmers against dairy farmers. Every farmer -every dairy farmer across the U.S. is suffering right now due to our low milk prices. I believe it is more important now than ever for dairy farmers to unite and work together, whether it's through our co-ops, National Milk, farm bureau or any other organization. The time is upon us that we need to speak as one. I am very much in favor of this proposed settlement, and I would like to ask the Court to support it as well. THE COURT: Thank you. BRYAN DAVIS: Thank you. THE COURT: Connie Menard. CONNIE MENARD: Good afternoon, your Honor. I, like Bryan, have never testified before so please bear with me also. And I really want to thank you for the opportunity to speak today. I was very excited to know that -- that I was allowed to do so. THE COURT: If you just would spell your last name. CONNIE MENARD: Yes. My name is Connie Menard, M-e-n-a-r-d. THE COURT: And I should just say for the

record, testimony is usually when you are under oath, so you are making comments.

CONNIE MENARD: Okay.

THE COURT: So anybody who is worried about testifying, don't -- doesn't need to worry about that because you are making comments, but you won't be considered testifying unless you are under oath. Okay?

CONNIE MENARD: Okay, thank you, your Honor.

I have learned something today.

My family has a dairy farm in Moores, New York, and we are members of St. Albans Cooperative Creamery, and we have been just since 2006. Before that, we belonged to a cooperative that had decided to dissolve, and when we began our search for a new cooperative, we had many options available. As a matter of fact, we were courted quite heavily by several of the co-ops. We chose St. Albans because of the smaller side of the co-op, the transparency of the management and the finances, and also the equitable treatment of all of its members.

Your Honor, my husband and I began our farm in 1986. Last year we hit a milestone as we became a limited liability company, and we brought our son and his wife into the business legally through lawyers and everything. Their children are -- my grandchildren are the third generation on our family farm. We have 85

milking cows and 75 young stock. In today's standards, we would be considered a fairly small farm.

Seven miles away, my brothers have a fairly large farm. We work together occasionally for the good of both farms, and it helps us both to be more profitable. The size of their operation allows them to realize cost efficiencies and timeliness with field work that they pass on to us.

I believe that the relationship between St. Albans Cooperative, DFA and DMS are a lot like the relationship our small farm has with the large farm. Each remains autonomous in their finances and leadership. DFA opens up marketing opportunities for us, and by working together, we can serve our customers more efficiently, therefore adding to our margins. We are able to use our new powder plant to its best capacity, and we collaborate on milk hauling both from the farm and to the customers.

There are benefits for their producers that they make available to our producers as well. Dairy cooperatives are a great asset to producers, and when cooperatives work together, everybody wins.

Your Honor, there are dairy producers that know nothing about their co-op. They do not ask questions. They do not understand how a cooperative works or about

how their milk is marketed, and some farmers are okay with that. They just want to farm and get a check and it is what it is. I'll be honest with you. I was in that position at one time. When we purchased our farm we had a big fat debt and a young family, and I just had to farm, but it came a point in time when I realized there was part of the business that I needed to learn more.

Some farmers feel that their cooperative is out of reach. Perhaps the only contact they have with their cooperative is the man or person who picks up their milk. They may want to know more but they don't know to ask or where to go for answers. They may be afraid to ask questions for fear of sounding ignorant or accusatory. They may be too shy to speak up at meetings, or maybe they have asked questions at some point but never really got a clear answer.

If these farmers had had someone to go to that was easily accessible, an outside person whom they could trust, maybe they would understand more how the co-op is structured, how it is managed, feel more like it is a part -- like they are a part of it, and get more involved.

The suggested appointment of an ombudsperson as proposed in this settlement would be a perfect fit for

farmers in this scenario. They could go to this person to confirm or deny rumors that they heard and would hopefully realize that those who say the co-op is against them are wrong. As their questions get answered and they become more comfortable within their organization, they will realize that the co-op is actually an extension of their own business.

Another piece of this settlement that I appreciate is the addition of the advisory council member. On our farm is always a positive experience to have someone new look at our operation, a fresh set of eyes and new ideas to bring better plans and practices that could possibly lead to more profit. This position will bring value for sure.

Our farm family believes in our cooperative. We have a deep trust and faith in the leadership and are aware of how much it enhances our business. I truly believe that every dairy farmer should be able to experience the same peace of mind. Putting this settlement behind us, along with the changes proposed, will help to make this happen. Thank you again, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Mark Magnan.

MARK MAGNAN: Good afternoon, your Honor.

THE COURT: Good afternoon.

MARK MAGNAN: Thank you for the opportunity to be here. My name is Mark Magnan, M-a-g-n-a-n.

I farm in Fairfield and St. Albans, with three brothers and my parents. I farm on a farm in Fairfield where my grandfather emigrated from Canada and my father was born in the farmhouse that we have today almost 90 years ago.

In talking to my father this morning, we were talking about things that was going on today and what we had to do. Amongst planting corn and fixing fence, I also stated I was coming to this hearing, to which he almost interrupted me saying anything else, and he said, "That should be front and center." He said from what he knows about it, people need to go to these and put this behind us.

My father told me a couple of stories about when he started farming. He could relate back to the '30s, '40s and '50s, and he said there was no communication with their milk handler back then. Today, as he knows, we get production information from our co-op daily on our iPhones, lab results, and many other programs that we as dairy farmers can take part of. My father was also one of the driving forces behind me to becoming a director of St. Albans Co-op.

As director of St. Albans Co-op, I am very proud of the work that we at St. Albans and DFA collaborate together with. When we work together, such as getting market premiums out of the marketplace, it makes much more sense to go to milk buyers as one unified voice rather than two or multiple. We can garner more premiums from the marketplace, and that is what -- exactly what DMS does.

We also gain efficiencies in transportation. For instance, if you have a DFA farm and a St. Albans farm on the same road, we have come up with programs where one truck will pick up both farms, even though they're not a member of the same co-op, to save and garner trucking efficiencies. That means real returns for dairy farmers. This gives the independence to the farmers. They can still remain with whomever they are loyal to, but yet we can gain efficiencies.

Building strengths helps build good relationships with our customers as well. They know -- farmers know they can rely upon the co-op, and today that is exactly what farmers need. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Tim Magnant.

 $\label{total magnant: Good afternoon,} % \end{substitute} % \begin{substitute}{0.5\textwidth} \end{substitute} % \begin{substitute}{0.5\textw$

THE COURT: Good afternoon.

TIMOTHY MAGNANT: Thank you for the opportunity to speak.

My name is Timothy Magnant, M-a-g-n-a-n-t. I own a farm in the beautiful area up in northern Vermont, Franklin. I border on the southwest side of the village which provides its challenges with -- I have to have a lot of community action to keep -- make my farm work with keeping the neighbors happy, and farming's something I have enjoyed all my life.

I farm there with my wife, Martha, and my two now-grown and moved-on daughters, Danielle and Desiree, who grew up with the farm values which are very important.

The one who told me -- taught me most of my farming experience was my father who took Mark Magnan, the previous speaker's -- he took my father's place on the board of directors for the St. Albans Co-op. And I learned a lot about my co-op through my father.

They speak for us nationally. They speak for us in the state on policies, and they provide a lot of support for our farmers other than milk marketing. Whether it be water quality issues or other issues, our co-op is very important to us for being our voice and a big voice.

One of the things that I've really appreciated is our co-op just put in a new dryer, redid the plant. We haven't had a lot of investment in Franklin County or even Vermont for our industry. Our board of directors, wise businessmen, were able to put us there, put the dryer in, make us -- for these times when they talk about the weekend milk, they can dry and powder it. They can move that milk. Like they say, we have a safe market.

As far as our board of directors, whether it's the co-op store, whether I meet Harold John or I meet Bryan Davis or whoever, I can ask 'em a question; they're always front and center and allow me to speak to 'em and give me advice or let me know what -- you know, what the milk industry looks like or what's going on with our co-op. They will talk to us.

Our CEO, Leon Berthiaume, same way. If you see him, he's always open to you. I think our -- I have had good luck at being able to talk to 'em as farmers, as co-op members. They are always available to me. I have had an excellent experience.

I would be in favor of us settling this today. I think the ombudsperson is a good idea. I think the person on the advisory council could provide new ideas. I think if we settle this, I think we can move forward.

I agree with the previous speakers that this is kind of a black eye for us. We need to move on. We need to do better PR and band together and work together. Thank you for your time.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Harold Howrigan, Jr.

HAROLD HOWRIGAN, JR.: Good afternoon,

your Honor. I'm Harold Howrigan, H-a-r-o-l-d

H-o-w-r-i-g-a-n. Thank you for allowing me the time to

provide comments today on this important issue.

I am a member of St. Albans Co-op Creamery. Our family has shipped milk to the St. Albans Co-op for over 40 years. I farm with my brothers, Michael and Lawrence, our wives, and my mom is still involved; and my brothers and I have six sons that work with us on the farm, and we have some girls too but they are not on the farm. We currently milk around 1200 cows, have an additional 800 young stock.

While growing up on our family farm in the '60s and '70s, our formative years, cooperative was a very household word, one that we all realized the importance and value of. We sold our milk to the St. Albans Co-op, and we sold our syrup to the Franklin County Maple Co-op. And in the 1980s, when our farm needed to grow to accommodate our growing family, we turned to Yankee

Farm Credit, a financial institution with cooperative government and values.

As diverse as these entities all were in the services they provided to our farm, their core principles that they operate on were all virtually identical. They have boards of directors elected from their farmer member owners. Their governance and oversight was provided by these farmers. All the profits were either reinvested in their business or paid out to their members in dividends.

In the early 1900s, it became imperative that dairy farmers worked collectively to market their milk to ensure that they had a fair price and that their milk got picked up, period. The dairy cooperative is an extension of the farm or the farm's an extension of the co-op, whichever way you look at it. But at the end of the day, the co-op puts all farmers on a level playing field, large and small. For one dollar, you can purchase a voting common stock in St. Albans Co-op, and with that dollar you can milk all the cows that your heart desires. And it also gives you access to milk testing, hauling programs, seed and grain purchasing and fertilizer financing, access to risk management advice. And it goes on.

As the dairy industry transitioned into the 21st

century, milk production increased, the number of dairies decreased. The milk market changed significantly also with the consolidation of markets and customer mergers. Dairy co-ops' marketing options became fewer with more demands. DMS was formed by farmer-owned co-ops to create some more efficiencies in the movement and marketing of milk and to help deal with these multinational corporations that were buying our milk markets, to commingle milk, to create efficiencies in hauling, field personnel to name a few.

At this time we became affiliated with DFA at our co-op, and I think it's probably one of the best things we have ever done. Instead of competing with them for markets when milk was long, we're working with them in markets to gain premiums and efficiencies wherever we could.

As we gather here today at this fairness hearing after seven years of litigation, I really think it's time to approve this settlement and let the farmers and their cooperatives and the industry move on to focus on some positive and productive things that we need so badly.

The new language in the proposal, along with the advisory council member and the farmer ombudsperson, will sufficiently address all the concerns that the

plaintiffs have raised over the course of this process. These new positions, in addition to all the current staff, should provide dairy farmers the assurance that DFA/DMS are serving the best interests of their dairy farmer member owners.

It would be important for these new representatives to become versed on how milk is priced, the challenges and fluctuations of the markets, co-op margins, and their member milk components. They all fluctuate seasonal. However, the most important part moving forward would be in the communication, will still be on the responsibility of the members to attend the meetings, to read the newsletters, to build a relationship with the co-op staff, the CEO or directors, so that when they do have an issue, they'd feel comfortable picking up the phone and calling, or if they see 'em on the street or at church. Just -- conversation is easy if you know somebody. And if you don't go there, you're always afraid just to ask a simple question.

All this new language, access to financial information, third-party testing, it will still take two willing people to communicate efficiently and effectively. Our co-ops have always gone above and beyond to help our members, whether it's split samples,

sample rechecks. At our farm, we have 34 years running of top-quality milk, and we have had sample requests over the years, and most of the time when we thought our components were off, it was something to do with our feed efficiencies and the co-op was glad to help.

Judge Reiss, I thank you again for this opportunity to speak, and after seven years, it's comforting to me to see that there is some positive things coming out of this hearing. With an additional advisory person on the board and a new set of eyes looking at things for a different way and somebody to mediate the questions that the members have, this has all gotta be good, and the transparency that the whole process has brought forward. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Alice Allen.

ALICE ALLEN: Good afternoon, your Honor.

THE COURT: Good afternoon.

ALICE ALLEN: I'm Alice H. Allen, A-l-i-c-e H. Allen, A-l-l-e-n. It's a privilege to speak before you today.

And my history of the dairy business is a long one.

I am not a second-generation farmer. I am actually
first-generation. My ancestors in Finland were dairy
farmers and my ancestors in Canada were dairy farmers.

I'm really the first one in this country, but my history of involvement with the dairy business goes back to my mentors. I call them my uncles although they weren't my blood uncles. They were the Watt Brothers, DM Watt and Sons, and they were producer dealers, and I milked cows for them while I was in college, and one of the first things they taught me was, "If you are going to go in the business, Alice, you can't just milk cows. You have gotta market your milk. You have gotta pay attention to your market." They really had to because they were producer dealers. They -- every bit of milk they made, they bottled and sold. And if they made too much milk and it went into the pool, they lost a lot of money.

So they taught me very well, and when I went out on my own, I bought heifers from them. I milked cows for them and they paid me in heifer calves. And when I started out on my own on a rented farm, I took their advise seriously and I joined a co-op. It was a small marketing co-op, and I became very involved and was later admitted to the board of directors, and once I was on the board, they asked me to write their newsletter. They never had a newsletter before. So I started writing their newsletter, and that was back in the '70s.

And early in the 1980s, there were a group of us young farmers -- we were young then, not so young now --

and we formed a milk-marketing study group. We were called the Young Farmers Milk Marketing Study Group, and that has evolved into the New Hampshire-Vermont Milk Marketing Study Group. But we held meetings, and one of the things that we -- we noticed over the years, that we had really good participation when milk prices were low, but the participation sort of dwindled when prices got high.

And, again, looking back to my uncles, my so-called uncles, it was important that we advocate for farmers to get involved, because we're all really good at making milk and growing crops, but the biggest part of our business should be in marketing, and that actually is probably the essence of the problems here, that farmers didn't get as involved as they should.

So here I am, being the named plaintiff in this case, and my husband, Larry, is also a named plaintiff. He's the brains behind the outfit. I am the mouth. And I have to confess to your Honor that early in the game of this case, I also was one of the angry class representatives, and I was thinking that our attorneys weren't doing what they should. They weren't listening to us. And we knew all there was to know of the milk business, and they weren't -- they weren't fighting for us.

Then my husband, the smart one, said after a particularly angry phone call with other class reps, he said, "You guys know what is achievable through an antitrust class action litigation?" Wow. So we started the investigation, I guess you could call it, and I contacted my own personal lawyer in St. Johnsbury and asked him questions, and then I have a very good friend who is a retired lawyer from Washington, D.C., and asked him. We started to learn that, gosh, what our attorneys were doing was what they were supposed to be doing. They were antitrust lawyers, and they knew their stuff.

Another thing that my lawyer in Vermont told me is you couldn't find law firms in the state of Vermont or New Hampshire that could do what these attorneys are doing for you farmers. So that was, I guess you could call it, my epiphany.

So when we learned that our attorneys really were working for us, instead of being angry with them and arguing with them, Larry and I decided, well, we're going to work with them, and we are going to ask questions. And I have to say that I pestered the daylights out of them. And they have been very kind all the way along, answered my questions and then some.

And I feel that we owe a great debt to them, and I will not say a word against the fees that they need to

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

get because they have earned it. There's no other firm that I have been aware of that could take on the load that they took and be responsive to the criticism that they received and still do their job.

And there was an interesting thing that I will add from the end of Vermont's legislative session this year. House Speaker Shap Smith made a comment that really struck me. He said, "Criticism is vital to a functioning democracy." Then he went on to say that discussion and disagreement is a good thing, but there comes a time when constant criticism and disagreement becomes counterproductive. And I think that may have happened in this case. And I agree that not all of us will agree that this settlement is a good settlement, but in my opinion, after having been involved in this case from the beginning, and under the advice of my long-dead uncles, I believe that what we have gained through this settlement -- the farmers have talked about the ombudsperson, and that to me personally is a very, very important part of this injunctive relief, because some of the Shire farmers or the farmers who maybe aren't sure that they should ask a question, now there's someone they can go to and they can get answers.

The advisory council person is also an extremely person important. These are things that we haven't had

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

before, and to just throw them out and say -- and marginalize them and say this isn't going do any good is really a shame because we worked very hard, and I think this is a new beginning.

And the other thing that is very important to me is, when you look around the room and you see all the farmers that have taken time from their farms in a really busy crop season right now, to come and express their support or their opposition, it's important. have engaged farmers. They have become involved, and that's a good thing because that is, in the future, the only way we are going to have a positive impact, and working together, it's difficult, it's very difficult, and, again, functioning democracy needs criticism, but we also need to work together. And I think that this settlement gives us an opportunity to move forward and work together. And there's a glut of milk all over the world. It's not just in this country. And my husband was also a milk hauler, so I got to see as a dairy farmer and a milk hauler's wife what goes on when trying to balance milk, and it's not -- it's not easy.

And I think some of these co-ops do a good job, some do better than others, but I think it's something farmers need to be made aware of that you need to have a co-op board and co-op management that understands these

issues, and I am not saying that DFA has been saintly in all of this. They have work to do, but this settlement would keep their feet to the fire. There are now a lot more farmers that are paying attention, and that's what we need.

And I thank you very much for the privilege and the honor of speaking to you today, your Honor. Thank you very much.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Robin Sweet.

ROBIN SWEET: Afternoon.

THE COURT: Good afternoon.

ROBIN SWEET: Robin, R O B I N; Sweet,

S-w-e-e-t, Senior.

I wanted to express my views about this settlement.

I have been -- I am on my fifth generation on the farm.

I farm with my wife and my son. And I'm probably one of the smallest farms speaking today, so.

I have served on the DFA Northeast Council for the last nine years. Before that I was a delegate. And I was kind of disappointed and upset with the plaintiffs that think that we would sit there on the council and look the other way while the co-op would take advantage of the farmers and lower the base price. I thought we was all together on this, and I am in favor of settling

the lawsuit.

I feel the money spent on the lawsuit could have been put to better use for product development and marketing to get a better price for the milk. And it's dragged on for a long time, and it really should come to a close.

Many of the provisions with the -- with the advisory council member and -- it would all be taken very seriously. Being a small farmer, I was treated just as good on the board as the large farms, and they listened to me, and it could be a good way to get back to the farms for information, more information, and it's a lot more than it used to be.

Years ago, when I was farming with my father, we have been through two or three different co-ops, and DFA has been a lot more transparent than a lot of them have been. They just -- they're bigger.

And the ombudsman, it's a very important part.

Like I say, there's a lot of farmers that won't speak

up, don't come to the meetings, but if they feel they

have somebody they can talk to, it would be beneficial

and it would help 'em get along a little better, so.

With that, it's getting close to chore time, so I will be short. So thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Heidi Dolloff.

HEIDI DOLLOFF: Good afternoon, your Honor.

I'm Heidi, H-e-i-d-i, Dolloff, D-o-l-l-o-f-f.

Thank you for the opportunity to participate in this hearing today. My name is Heidi Dolloff, and with my husband, Michael, and our two children -- Hannah who's 12 and Matthew who is 6 -- I operate a 75-cow dairy farm in Springfield, Vermont.

Both my husband and I grew up on our family dairy farms in New Hampshire, but due to circumstances beyond our control, we did not have the opportunity to continue farming them. So due to our desire to continue farming, we bought an empty farm in Springfield where we began our dairy.

I am a 4-H club leader. I serve as vice chair of our state and regional promotion organization. I have been a past president of our county farm bureau, and I have been a past board of trustee on the state farm bureau. I also serve on our county FSA committee, and I am a DFA delegate.

In 2014, we received the honor of being named

Vermont's Dairy Farm of the Year. I am here in support

of this settlement. We produce about 1.8 million pounds

of raw milk annually that has been marketed through

Dairy Farmers of America since 2003 when we joined the

cooperative.

From 1997, when we began farming in Springfield, to joining DFA in 2003, we were an independent farm. As a small dairy, we faced many challenges dealing directly with the processors. We found significant value in the DMS system, and because of the secure milk market and the stability we found in the DMS system, we chose to join DFA in 2003. Not only did I like the equity structure of DFA, I felt that the cooperative had its members' best interests in mind, and by taking the business of marketing my milk off my plate, I am able to focus on what I love to do: ensuring good health of my cows and producing high-quality milk.

I have never once worried about the business side of things within DFA. And since joining DFA, I am confident of the abilities and appreciate the transparent nature of the organization. Multiple times throughout the year I attend leadership conferences that I have direct access to the top management and the top dairy farmer leaders within DFA, and they will give me honest answers to my questions.

DFA is a strong farmer-like grass roots cooperative that I know is looking out for the best of their members and the industry as a whole.

In the settlement DFA has admitted no wrongdoing,

and I personally believe they have not -- they have done -- they have not done anything wrong. I am for the provision in the settlement that will allow all members to feel as confident about the cooperative as I do.

The installation of the advisory member and the ombudsman's roles on the council may be valuable for some members by providing access to a third party for questions and grievances. I think whenever there is more transparency involved, it is a good thing.

Dairy farming to Mike and I is more than a milk check. It is a way of life. And our cooperative is our biggest partner in helping us protect our right to farm. So we need to continue to work together, to support the settlement, and put this lawsuit behind us once and for all. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Ed King?

EDGAR KING: Good afternoon, your Honor.

THE COURT: Good afternoon.

EDGAR KING: It's a privilege to be here to represent my friends and my neighbors and my co-op members.

I am a third-generation dairy farmer --

THE COURT: So we probably can guess at the spelling of your name, but I need to make sure --

EDGAR KING: Oh, King, K-i-n-g. First name Edgar, E-d-g-a-r. I apologize. I had that written right in front of me and I totally overlooked it.

I am a third-generation dairy farmer. I farm with my wife and two of our four sons on a farm that's been in the family for about 110 years. We're excited that we have high school-age grandchildren who want to farm. As you can see, that would make the fifth generation. Together, we milk about a thousand cows near Schuylerville, New York. Now that's in eastern edge of New York, north of Albany about 40 miles.

I have had the privilege of representing my neighbors and friends for 20 years on the Dairylea board of directors and for a couple years recently, and then I decided it was time to pass the baton.

I grew up on my family's dairy farm. I graduated from Cornell in 1963, and I had the foresight to be married before I graduated so my wife and I came back home and began dairying with 32 cows.

In 1972 we expanded by constructing a 110-cow barn. And as our sons came home to the business, and in one case one left for another pursuit, we have grown the business to the present size today. It's been sort of static for a few years.

We love our cows. We're fortunate to have

developed the kind of cattle that others appreciate.

And marketing them has proven to be both satisfying and profitable. Our family's always marketed our milk through a cooperative because we recognize that their -- that the cooperative's professional marketers are best qualified to represent us in the marketplace.

I have been active in a number of farm organizations, and I currently or I have served as an elder in my church for, I don't know, more than 40 years. I didn't really look back, but it's more than 40.

And my interest and issues facing farmers resulted in me becoming a bit of an industry activist that led to leadership positions in numerous organizations, and I have had some experience that not a lot of other farmers have had. I -- among other things, I spent 11 years as a deputy commissioner of agriculture in New York where I had all of the milk program responsibilities, both economic and sanitary. After that I spent some time in our Assembly with the Assembly agriculture committee. That relates to your House here in Vermont. And I was the dairy industry guru for the Assembly ag committee and for a joint legislative commission on dairy industry development.

That was followed by three years as manager of

government and customer relations with the Regional Cooperative Marketing Agency known in the trade as -- the acronym was RCMA, and that was a super co-op. It priced fluid milk for all the co-ops and for independent farmers in the marketplace in the Northeast.

All during that time, I -- by the good graces of my wife and my family, we continued with our dairy farm operation, but I have had some unique experiences, and I have had the chance to sort of look at things from different perspectives, and the knowledge that I gained while serving in all these various capacities is that the business of marketing milk to processors is very demanding. In short, it's a tough business, a business that's not for the faint hearted and therefore best left to professionals, like cooperative.

I just can't seem to give up this public work so I serve today as -- and I think my sons enjoy it that I am away from the farm, and -- but I enjoy working with them. I serve as a pro bono commissioner representing agricultural issues, interests, on our New York State board of real property services. And for the last seven years I have chaired the New York State Farm Service Agency state committee. So why am I here today?

I am here because I strongly support the proposed settlement. I have attended a number of these hearings,

and I have reviewed the proposal, and I am completely in favor of it. We can accomplish what we need to best by working through, I believe, the structure of DFA/DMS and others in order to receive the highest possible returns for our members.

I have watched all of the machinations in the marketplace, from seeing producers lose markets, people who thought they had a guaranteed market forever with a processor only to be dumped because the processor had too much milk. And DFA's never -- never terminated a member because we had too much milk. We have marketed that milk for our members. And I think that's to our credit. We didn't seek to get away from the responsibility of marketing all the milk that we had.

Never before has bringing resolution to this issue been more critical than it is now, especially given the excess supply of milk in our region. As I see it, the farmers opposing the settlement -- and I will be kind of blunt here -- most likely are probably seeking to destroy DFA. That's my opinion.

My experience in the marketplace tells me that given today's market conditions, if DFA no longer existed, given today's present market conditions, prices would -- to the farm, would plummet. That's my observation, my estimation.

The settlement provides -- it gives provisions which would add a new voice to the area council -- I am in support of that -- and a new person for others to approach to resolve the issues of distrust about DFA and DMS. There's nothing we can't solve if we talk to each other. Therefore, I see it a benefit to the portion of the settlement entitled Farmers', Affiliates' and Cooperatives' Right to Terminate. This provision would enable an unsatisfied member to terminate their membership upon their request. That wouldn't be constrained.

So in summary, I just wish to see this lawsuit end, period. That's why I'm here today. I thank you for your attention and allowing me for the opportunity to express my thoughts.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Darlene Reynolds.

DARLENE REYNOLDS: Hello. My name is

Darlene Reynolds, D-a-r-l-e-n-e R-e-y-n-o-l-d-s. And I

am here in support of settling this.

I am a first-generation farmer. My husband had a farm with his family but they divorced, and so we were out to start on our own in 1991, and during that time, we leased cows and we leased a farm, and it was a rough start, you know, when you try and take and start on your

own and get everything started. And then we were able to move from Highgate to Alburg, Vermont, where we are now, in 1994, and began our journey of becoming the farmers that we are today.

We currently milk about 685 cows, and we have about 450 young stock. And I also have four daughters, and we're a very feminine farm. About 50 percent of the people that we have employed for us are female, and I take a lot of pride in that. And our current name is Crosswinds Dairy and Daughters. And I am a member of DFA, and I was not a member of DFA in the beginning. I had a previous cooperative but chose, in 2002, to become a DFA person.

The first immediate thing that I got when I came to DFA is how much involvement they wanted me to become into, which excited me, because as a first generation, and me not from a dairy farm -- I actually have a degree in social work -- I really wanted to find out how things worked, and the first thing they said is, Well, why don't you become a delegate. So it was -- it took me probably three or four years. I made the decision why, why not. So I became a delegate and I feel like my educational journey had began where I was able to do some traveling to annual meetings. I was able to go to Syracuse for other meetings. And it allowed me to find

out how milk marketing worked. It allowed me how to figure out that the Northeast was not the sole place for milk, and it wasn't just in Vermont that things happened, that it was on a national level. It really gave me a good objective of what we were doing back at home, you know, of what was going on nationally as well.

So I think that in settling this, with the people that you have on the advisory committee, the council, as well as the ombudsperson to help with mediation, it only pushed forward on the educational piece.

And I want to say -- I want to thank Miss Allen for coming up here in support of this settlement. I think it's the first step in us as a family, because I believe -- even being a first-generation, I gotta say that everybody that's behind me, they're a part of my family now. They say that they're third-, fourth-. I have always been impressed on how much they have allowed me, being kind of an outsider, to come in and be a part of it and treat me as an equal and become a part of that family.

So with this being settled, I believe it can start the process of healing and pushing our industry forward, which it desperately needs right now with the fact of what's going on in our milk markets. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Rob Morrill.

ROB MORRILL: Thank you, your Honor, for the privilege of speaking today. My name is Rob Morrill, M-o-r-r-i-l-l. And our family resides in Concord -- Pennycook, New Hampshire, which is a village within the city of Concord. Geography is we are an hour north of Boston, an hour west of the Atlantic Ocean, and an hour south of the White Mountains.

We are very fortunate to farm within the city of the capitol of New Hampshire where I actually live. We farm approximately a hundred acres of field land right there that goes back to the first minister of the city of Concord that our farm currently owns, my wife and I. And when we're working out in the fields, in the background is the capitol dome of the city, so -- of the whole state. Excuse me.

But we farm in the village of Pennycook. My grandfather purchased that farm in 1925. I'm the third generation myself, and three of our sons is involved in the business. There's a fourth generation. They officially came in and we became an LLC in 2012, where we expanded and leased a second location 60 miles away in Acworth, New Hampshire, which is on the Connecticut River Valley. So we've learned what farming two operations 60 miles apart is like, but their future

is they hope to build a new facility.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

My wife and I were very blessed with four children. The three boys have come back to the farm. And our daughter currently is on staff at Cornell as a dairy extension specialist, and she married a dairy farmer in upstate, near Potsdam, New York. So to think that they all wanted to be part of the dairy industry, we were very fortunate because I can remember taking -- going with my grandfather with canned milk to the plant on North State Street in Concord when I was a very, very young boy. They were a member of Concord Dairy, which was a farmer-owned co-op back then, of which today it is owned by HP Hood company, and the milk from our farm still goes to that exact same plant. Every year of my life that is where our milk has gone, and I drive past that plant every day going to and from my house to the farm. So that's kind of a unique thing within our industry because so many people don't have an awareness.

However, in approximately 2003, we had been through Concord Co-op. They merged with Weeks Dairy. It was sold to Crowley Foods, then to NDS. Then the plant was sold to HP Hood. During the Crowley time was when DMS was formed. We were independent producers at that point and it didn't take too long to realize we needed to become members of this co-op because, yes, we felt we

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

had a very strong market because it was right there, the fluid market, but the market -- milk-marketing industry has changed today considerable. It's not a local market. It is a world market, and milk marketing, you need to be looking at the world market all the time today for this industry. And so this settlement allows DMS and DFA to pursue those interests. They don't need to be tying up energy, you know, to take care of this litigation. They can be pursuing the avenues to help us as farmers back on the farm, to procure our milk markets, because if we let things go the way they are today, unfortunately, I am afraid, that it could be worse than it is. And, you know, I am looking at -really enjoyable to looking forward to watching the future generations of our farm continue, and, you know, we need this settlement to settle so we can move forward. So we are continually in support of this litigation to be settled. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you.

That's the end of the people who gave us notice, timely notice of their intent to appear and who are actually class members and haven't opted out.

So we are going to take our midafternoon break. It will be approximately 10 minutes. When we come back, if the attorneys want to make any further arguments, they

may do so. 1 Anything to bring to my attention before we break? 2 3 MR. PIERSON: No, your Honor. THE COURT: Let me ask, what would you like to 4 5 bring to my attention? 6 CLAUDIA HAAR: Just that I had wanted Joshua 7 Haar to speak as my proxy, and Dave Ward and Rod 8 Jennison had also wanted him to speak on their behalf, and we weren't sure if you were going to save that to 9 10 before the counsel or after. 11 THE COURT: Why don't we do that right now and 12 we will take our break afterwards. 13 CLAUDIA HAAR: Thank you. 14 THE COURT: So come on forward. And I thought that you had given the proxy to Jonathan Haar, but I 15 16 understand that it's now been given to you. So go ahead 17 and say your name for the record. 18 JOSHUA HAAR: Thank you very much. Joshua 19 Haar. That's H-a-a-r. 20 All right, yes. A couple quick remarks to begin 21 here. 22 First of all, I wish to thank the Court for hearing 23 from as many people as it has today, and I wish to thank 24 everyone who has showed up. 25 As quite a few of us have heard today, it is very

difficult to get farmer input. And even so, I wish to direct the attention to the Court that very few of those who spoke today are not personally affiliated with either a named defendant or a co-conspirator. The reason the law provides that the Court must consider the reaction of the class, not the defendants, is that defendants and those affiliated with them have a clear incentive to settle.

Of course these individuals think it's time for this case to be settled. In the case of DFA members, Northeast Area Council members, and DairyOne, these people are members of organizations which are personally called to task for their violations of federal antitrust law. In the case of members of St. Albans Cooperative, their cooperative participated with DFA in creating DMS, which is a named defendant also being brought to task for its violations of federal law.

Now, regarding the response of the class, there are, I understand, approximately 1200 letters in support of this proposed settlement whereas last time there was barely a dozen. It's pretty clear what happened.

There's only one party to this case that has the ability to reach that many farmers, together with the power to make sure these farmers actually sign and deliver letters in support.

I would like to refer the Court to, in our list of exhibits, the -- I believe it is the plastic page where you have there the Oneida-Madison Milk Cooperative annual meeting agenda, and if you turn to page -- the second page of that agenda, you will note that two DFA members appear on the agenda.

Now, my understanding is that the law states that it is improper for defendants to contact class members in regard to settling a case. Not only were these people contacted, they presented at the meeting, and if you turn to the next page, you will see on the Oneida-Madison Milk Co-op settlement update this co-op put out a request for support of the settlement.

We heard from several members of the South New Berlin Co-op today. I would refer the Court to the declaration of Mr. Kenneth Dibbell, document 722, filed March 11, 2016, in which case Mr. Dibbell was personally threatened by Mr. Ed King, general manager of the South New Berlin Co-op, because, quote, If I -- this is Mr. Dibbell speaking. Quote: If I encouraged farmer members to oppose this settlement through my petition -- DFA markets a hundred percent of South New Berlin milk -- these people are on the line for their entire cooperative.

I would also like to refer the Court to the letter

All South New Berlin Co-op Milk Producers. This was delivered to my proxy provider, I guess, Mr. Dave Ward: These co-ops are tightening the noose around the necks of farmers as DMS realizes that if it does not get enough support for this settlement, it is going down.

I would also like to refer the Court to the letter -- just a moment, please. Okay, Cortland Bulk Milk Producers Corporation. This is document number 724, filed March 16, 2016. Mr. Stuart Young, the CEO of East River Dairy and president of Cortland Bulk Milk Producers Corporation, says, I quote: DFA and DMS are responsible for marketing most of our members' milk.

Now, we were surprised to see this letter on the docket because we had seen that name recently too. If you turn to the next page, you will see the Dairy Farmers of America. This is our milk production slip from October 16, 2015, for the milk for the period ending November 30 last year. At the bottom of the page you will see a \$16 deduction going to Cortland Bulk Milk Producers Corporation. That shows very clearly how we obtained the support: We purchased it.

THE COURT: Okay. A couple more minutes.

JOSHUA HAAR: Yes.

One other question I would have for the Court. I understand I started roughly four, five minutes ago.

Mr. Dave Ward and Mr. Rod Jennison both requested to speak, so I would like to know if I am permitted five to seven minutes or --

THE COURT: That wouldn't be fair to other people.

JOSHUA HAAR: -- the ten to 14?

THE COURT: So if you can finish up in the next three, four minutes, that would be fine.

JOSHUA HAAR: Okay. Will do so.

One other procedural issue with this settlement is, because -- Mr. Doug Ricker testified earlier -- excuse me, spoke earlier regarding the efforts of class counsel to secure new class representatives. It was clearly in their incentive to do so. But a look at the docket will explain that the action in response to that motive did not come from subclass counsel. It came from defendants; note the motion to decertify. This is what provided Mr. Pierson the opportunity to bring up these replacement class representatives. But that was not the only motive on the table.

You see, if you look a little further back to the filing from the Eastern District of Tennessee, you will see that Mr. Kuney did exactly the same thing, successfully decertifying the DFA subclass in the Southeast litigation. His signature appears at the top

of the filing. The primary -- or the first reason he listed for decertification was that the class members were -- or the class representatives, excuse me, were not DFA members and they were not typical of the DFA subclass.

None of the four people who Mr. -- the class counsel put forward as class representatives are DF- -- are or have ever been DFA members. Mr. Kuney knew that this would be a clear way to get the class undermined.

Now, Mr. Pierson also knew this because we told him when -- if you remember from proceedings a while back, the class certification hearing, when he had flown up to the farm to argue my father out of speaking, and that was one of the issues which we discussed at length. So Mr. Pierson knew that that would undermine his class, but he did it anyway so that he could get those class members on to tip the scales in favor of settlement.

Now, the presumption of fairness which applies in class actions is designed to safeguard settlements which are truly fair. Where the collusion has been such an issue in this case that this Court has felt compelled to reference it at multiple proceedings, and wherever evidence at this fairness hearing appears of professional misconduct on the part of the attorneys in trying to trick the class representatives into thinking

there was no relief available at trial, the presumption of fairness no longer applies.

So for -- for that reason, there are procedural issues with this settlement in addition to the substantive ones touched upon earlier. And on the whole, the coercion of so many of the class members --

Actually, one more note on that and then I will conclude.

THE COURT: Okay.

JOSHUA HAAR: Is that the -- we had submitted the declarations of -- I don't remember the exact number, but the farmers whose milk inspectors showed up and told them to sign this or they might not have a milk market, and I understand those for reasons were not received, but the fact of the matter is, there are 1200 letters --

THE COURT: Well, let me just -- let me just say.

JOSHUA HAAR: Okay.

THE COURT: If -- I can't look at things in private. So that's what I have tried to make clear. It's against the ethical rules for me to receive things. So if you want things docketed, that's fine, but I can't look at things without showing them to the parties and the attorneys without violating my rules.

JOSHUA HAAR: Okay, I understand. 1 2 THE COURT: So that's how that happened. 3 JOSHUA HAAR: So --THE COURT: So let's have you finish up --4 5 JOSHUA HAAR: Yep. 6 THE COURT: -- and then we will take our 7 break. 8 JOSHUA HAAR: So -- but the evidence appears 9 clearly on the docket where these letters came from. 10 You have the three opt-outs, docket numbers 2027, 2028, and 2025, which state, "When my milk inspector brought 11 12 me a form to sign" -- you have document number 1281 --13 "my DFA/DMS inspector asked me to fill this out and sign 14 it. I think it should be illegal for him to do this." 15 In fact, it is illegal. It's federal extortion. 16 So the procedural problems with this settlement, coupled 17 with its substantive inadequacies, require, in my humble opinion, that it be denied. The fact of the matter is, 18 19 it's -- it's simply not just to allow the conduct which 20 has been going on to continue, which is why the factors 21 provided under Grinnell provide plenty of discretion for 22 this settlement to be thrown out the way it deserves and 23 for our case to be brought forward. Thank you very 24 much. 25 THE COURT: Thank you.

All right. We will take our midafternoon break. 1 2 As I said, it's approximately 10 minutes or so, and we 3 will come back for any arguments the attorneys want to 4 present. Thank you. 5 (Court was in recess at 2:39 p.m.) 6 (The following was held in open court at 2:57 p.m.) 7 THE COURT: We are back on the record in Alice 8 Allen versus Dairy Farmers of America, and now we will 9 hear from the attorneys if they want to offer any 10 further argument in favor or against the settlement. 11 will start with the plaintiffs' counsel. 12 MR. PIERSON: Thank you, your Honor. 13 Pierson for the DFA/DMS subclass. And, your Honor, I 14 will be very brief. I will not use my five minutes, but 15 there were a couple comments I did want to make. 16 First, I --17 THE COURT: I wasn't planning on leaving the 18 attorneys with five minutes. 19 MR. PIERSON: No, I understand. 20 THE COURT: Okay. 21 MR. PIERSON: I am just kidding, your Honor, 22 but I will, in fact, be brief because I think -- I think 23 the Grinnell factors here -- and we will largely stand 24 on our briefs. I think the Grinnell factors very 25 clearly and decisively point in favor of settlement

here. 1 2 I did want to --3 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Can't hear AUDIENCE MEMBER: Can't hear. 4 5 THE COURT: Can't hear him. Okay. 6 MR. PIERSON: Okay. 7 All right. I did want to add that I think the 8 Court can get additional confidence here from the fact 9 that the Vermont Attorney General's Office has weighed 10 in, the Vermont Agricultural Committee, the Vermont Senate Appropriations Committee and the New Hampshire 11 12 Agricultural and Environmental Committee -- were all, I 13 think, additional indicia of reasonableness. 14 Your Honor, one of the -- one of the challenges in 15 this case -- and we're both painfully aware of it -- has 16 been -- has been the distrust and, in some instances, 17 hostility that characterizes aspects of this industry, and at some level I feel like, you know, we got caught 18 19 in the middle of that a little bit. 20 It's very, very difficult, but I think it's an 21 important aspect of the settlement that others have 22

It's very, very difficult, but I think it's an important aspect of the settlement that others have emphasized and that I wanted to emphasize that the settlement does a variety of things and a variety of things that haven't been accomplished by anyone in this industry in 20 years. But among those are -- are

23

24

25

disclosure of a very voluminous record so people can see what the real facts are as opposed to rumor.

Another thing is transparency in the management going forward. And the other is what a number of people talked about today, the role of the ombudsperson in particular in creating a better mechanism for dialogue so the industry can move forward based on facts and reality and an ability to have a dialogue, and I think those things are important.

The last two comments I wanted to make, your Honor, are these: So it's been seven years, and I do want to thank the Court for -- it's been a very challenging case, as you know. I want to thank you for your hard work, for your patience, and for -- and for your fairness, and it's recognized and appreciated.

I also want to give one other thank you, your Honor, which is to my colleagues, Brent Johnson and Emmy Levens. It's been a tough case for the attorneys. You know that. But I watched -- I hired these attorneys, and I have watched them grow up on this case for seven years. They have been incredibly dedicated to the subclass and to this litigation and to professionalism for seven years, and as their boss, as their friend, as their colleague, I want to thank them for their dedication.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

Anybody else from the plaintiffs' counsel that wants to speak?

MR. ABRAMS: Thank you, your Honor. Bob Abrams on behalf of the non-DFA/DMS subclass.

And I too want to thank the Court. I particularly want to -- I will make this point. When we came to you with the initial settlement agreement, I thought it was a very good settlement agreement. You suggested that we focus on some nonmonetary concepts. We did that, and we did it again. And I'm going to stand here and say I can tell you, at least from perspective, and I know the perspective of virtually everybody that I have interacted with, believes it is now an excellent settlement agreement.

I don't know that the history is particularly important, but a lot of these provisions, particularly the ombudsman provision -- for example, there was a provision in the Southeast SMA settlement provisions that was akin to that, but it isn't nearly as good as that. And we did go back and we, together with all the lead counsel on the plaintiffs' side and with DFA, forged what is truly, I think, an excellent nonmonetary provision in that respect and in many others that your Honor now sees.

So I think -- I thank you. I thank you on behalf 1 2 of the class we represent, and hopefully the Court will 3 approve the settlement. THE COURT: Thank you. 4 5 Anybody else from the plaintiffs' counsel 6 perspective? 7 MR. SMITH: Thank you, your Honor. Daniel 8 Smith for the non-DFA subclass. Also would be very brief. 9 10 I think when we came into the case we made it very clear that we had heard all of the directives that the 11 12 Court had provided for the path forward and tried to 13 follow that. I think you have heard from -- as to the 14 substantive provisions on the substantive side. The one 15 thing I would add there is that the -- the new council 16 members specifically tasked with dealing with higher 17 milk prices, which is ultimately the substance of this case, over-order premiums, that's the specific charge 18 that the advisory council was giving. 19 20 On the procedural side, I think the one --21 (Disruption from sound interference in 22 courtroom.) 23 MR. SMITH: On the procedural side, I

think the one thing to accentuate there is your clear

directive, was the need to hear from the class, and I

24

25

think what you have heard today is from the class, and you have received the letters that we received. I think both Commissioners Taylor and Aubertine gave their opinion that this is representative of the opinion of the class of what's been expressed to you. So those would be the two points that I would accentuate.

And I obviously don't have the history with the case to extend appreciation, but I would just end where I started, which is that the guidance you provided really did lay out the path for -- for reaching a settlement two days before Christmas. You gave us a pretty tight window, but we did manage to meet your path. Thank you.

THE COURT: All right, thank you.

Any further comments on behalf of plaintiffs' counsel before I turn to the defendants?

Mr. Kuney.

MR. KUNEY: Thank you, your Honor. Steve Kuney on behalf of DFA and DMS. I'll try to keep to the brevity that my colleagues have demonstrated so far.

I do appreciate the Court's attitude today in providing opportunity for all of the class members who had expressed an intention to speak to have the opportunity notwithstanding the issue about the timing of the postmarks. I'm glad those people had a chance to

speak, and I think they feel the way we would like people to feel about having had a chance to participate in a process and having their voices heard so that kind of as citizens and as class members I think they feel very good about the opportunity they had here this afternoon.

I want to do something that I almost never do anymore which is express surprise at this point in my career. I try not to say I am surprised by things. But as the -- typically in the class cases, being on the defense side, the settlement process is usually a bit of tug-of-war for all you are trying to do is not let the other side pull very far on the rope.

The way the negotiation process played out here, it actually became an opportunity to try to do something positive. And the many -- the praiseworthy comments you heard this afternoon about the new positions that have been created and about the new transparency that has been created, about the new, positive framework it may bring to bear on the co-op, the people on the DFA side actually endorse that wholeheartedly, and I can, as their counsel, endorse it as well, that it was a rare opportunity as a defendant in a class case to feel as if the settlement process gave me and us a chance to do something better notwithstanding our views about the

allegations that had led to the case in the first place. 1 2 So appreciate that, and appreciate the Court's patience and attention to the case throughout, and 3 again, thank you on behalf of the class members here 4 5 today. 6 THE COURT: All right. At this point I am 7 going to take the matter under advisement. I am going 8 to get you a prompt written decision. I have to do it in writing. It's just not something that the Court can 9 10 reel off on the record without giving careful consideration to the laws and the facts. 11 12 I have read everything that you filed. That was 13 quite an expedition of its own. And when I say prompt, 14 I do it in the Court's quotation marks, so what you 15 think is prompt might be different from what I think is 16 prompt, but certainly within the next 60 days. 17 Thank you. 18 MR. PIERSON: Thank you, your Honor. 19 MR. ABRAMS: Thank you, your Honor. 20 (Court was in recess at 3:08 p.m.) 21 22 CERTIFICATION I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the record of proceedings in the 23 above-entitled matter. 24 25 June 1, 2016 Anne Nichols Pierce Date